begins on the day prescribed, or appointed pursuant to, section 2 of article XX of the articles of amendment to the Constitution preceding the commencement of the fiscal year, and

"(2) for the fiscal year which begins on January 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, on or before July 15 of the year preceding the commencement of the fiscal year.

If the Congress is not in session on the day on which the President submits the budget for the fiscal year which begins on January 1, 1973, or for any fiscal year thereafter, such budget shall be transmitted to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and shall be printed as a document of the House of Representatives."

(b) This section shall become effective on July 1, 1972.

SEC. 302. (a) Section 201(a)(5) of such Act is amended by striking out "October 15" and inserting in lieu thereof "May 15".

(b) This section shall become effective on May 1, 1972.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, we have had some hearings occasionally before the Committee on Rules and Administration and the Joint Committee on Congressional Reorganization.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, first, I would appreciate it if the Senator would ask unanimous consent that I be listed as a cosponsor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I would be glad to.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Montana be added as a cosponsor of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, to my personal knowledge the distinguished Senator from Washington has been trying to get action on a bill of this nature for more than two decades, first while he was a Member of the House of Representatives and later during his many years in the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Substantially, I think the session this year points out the necessity for action of this kind. As far as I know, we are the only legislative body in the free world that does not divide its sessions. Every other legislative body in the free world has a legislative session; then, they have a date beyond which no further legislation will be considered and they go into their fiscal session. It seems to me this is the only way we can avoid some of the problems that are occurring now.

The President was somewhat critical of Congress the other day when he suggested the passage of appropriation bills. However, the appropriation bills are being held up because the authorization bills are not around and the authorization bills are not around because it took a long time for the administration—and I am not being critical because I think they want to examine all these matters—to send up legislative proposals.

Independent offices have been held up for weeks because there was no authorization on the space program. In connection with HEW, as the Senator from West Virginia knows, we have 300 or 400 witnesses we never had before because they want a reorganization. I do not know if that will succeed. The OEO appropriation is not here. These matters cause the problems.

I have sat in meetings of the Committee on Appropriations on many occasions when we would be passing on whether or not to fund a program of some kind that Congress had authorized and at the same time the Senate will be sitting here on the same day changing that program. The Senator from Colorado knows that.

If we had a legislative session we would know what we had authorized and what would have to be appropriated, and come back and do that. That is the purpose of the legislation I am introducing. I hope we can give it consideration.

I remember the night we adjourned last session. The Senator from Montana and I were here. I think only two or three of us were still in the Chamber. We were talking about the time of the session. Finally, we concluded there must be a better way to do it than the way we are doing it. We must try something new.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Will the Senator add my name to the list of cosponsors?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am happy to do so.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from West Virginia may be added as a cosponsor of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name may be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name may be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, there has to be a better way. This year we had a recess during the summer. Many Members of Congress, felt this was a good thing because it provided an opportunity for those who have families to spend time with their families. This bill would enable Members to do that.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF A JOINT RESOLUTION

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 163

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE) be added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 163, to supplement the joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970 in order to provide for carrying out programs and projects, and for payments to State educational agencies and local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, and other educational agencies and organizations, based upon appropriation levels as provided in H.R. 13111 which passed the House of Representatives July 31, 1969, and entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 45—SUBMISSION OF A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO PUBLIC EXPRESSION OF RELIGIOUS FAITH BY AMERICAN ASTRONAUTS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators STEVENS, COOPER, HOLLAND, FANNIN, THURMOND, SPONG, SMITH of Illinois, DOLE, ALLEN, COTTON, GURNEY, BYRD of Virginia, and ALLOTT, I am proud today to submit a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the expressions of religious faith by our astronauts in outer space were in accord with their first amendment rights of Freedom of Religion and that future astronauts should not be prohibited from engaging in similar expressions of faith while in future flights.

I was truly surprised that there would ever have been any criticism of our astronauts when on their voyages they reiterated their belief and trust in their religion. These expressions have been in the highest American tradition of public displays of faith. For example, here in the Senate, we open our daily sessions with a prayer and our motto is "in God we trust." The first amendment to the Constitution deals with the freedom of all Americans to worship as they see fit. To deny this right to our astronauts simply because they are on a Government mission would be violative of their rights.

Mr. President, I know that millions of Americans will never forget the reading of Genesis from the environs of the moon last Christmas Eve by Colonel Borman and his crew. This was truly one of the most moving national experiences that we have ever had, and it helped to lift our spirits as a nation.

If the enemies of religion had their way, such experiences would be condemned and any future ones prohibited. It is the purpose of this resolution to see that such a condemnation and prohibition does not occur.

I ask my colleagues to join with me in sponsoring this measure, so that we may help to insure that our astronauts may exercise their constitutional rights and that the enemies of religion shall not triumph.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 45), which reads as follows, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. CON. RES. 45

Whereas, there has been worldwide interest in the space program and extensive coverage of space projects by the mass media;

Whereas, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is directed by section 203(a)(3) of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Act of 1958 to "provide for the widest practicable and appropriate dissemination of information concerning its activities and the results thereof";

Whereas, the free exercise of religion and the freedom of speech for all Americans is protected by the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States;

Whereas, there are questions presently before the courts intended to test the prerogative of astronauts to express their religious faith publicly during the course of space flights: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that all the past expressions and exercises of religious faith practiced by the astronauts, during the space explorations, were compatible with the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States which guarantees the freedom of speech and religion. It is further resolved that the astronauts while engaged in any duties connected with the space program should not be obstructed from exercising these freedoms.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF A RESOLUTION

SENATE RESOLUTION 271

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) be added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 271, calling for peace in Vietnam.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Bill file

PROVISION THAT TIME SPENT BY A FEDERAL EMPLOYEE IN A TRAVEL STATUS SHALL BE CONSIDERED AS HOURS OF EMPLOYMENT—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 263

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I recently introduced a bill to make time spent by Federal employees in travel status hours of employment. It has since been pointed out to me that the original bill was too broad. I am submitting an amendment today which will make clear that time spent in travel status is hours of employment only if the employee is directed to undertake such travel as a part of his employment responsibilities.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, No. 263, was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That (a) Section 5542(b)(2) of Title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'(2) time spent in a travel status away from the official duty station of an employee is hours of employment only if an employee is directed to undertake such travel as part of his employment responsibilities.

"'(b) The last sentence of Section 5544 (a) of such title is amended to read as follows: "Time spent in a travel status away from the official duty station of an employee subject to this subsection is hours of work only if an employee is directed to undertake such travel as a part of his employment responsibilities.'"

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1970—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 264

Mr. BYRD of Virginia proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 12964, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, which was ordered to be printed.

(The remarks of Mr. BYRD of Virginia when he proposed the amendment appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 265

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I seriously question the wisdom of repealing the investment tax credit. It has been a mechanism of immense value to the economy, since it encourages plant modernization and therefore constantly improves productivity.

Repeal of the investment tax credit is proposed as a curb on inflation. I question whether it will have any such effect.

I am concerned that its repeal may instead contribute to inflation.

Inflationary trends of the past few years have been caused primarily by a soaring demand for goods and services. Newer, more productive capacity is the best means of meeting this demand and, thereby, easing inflationary pressures.

The 7 percent tax credit on investment in capital goods is one of the best tools we have for stimulating the replacement of less efficient productive capacity with the more efficient.

The need to expand and upgrade the country's productive capacity is a continuing one that has existed throughout our economic history. The investment tax credit is a long-term approach to meeting this need.

If the Congress decides, nevertheless, upon repeal, I urge most strongly that the credit be continued for the Nation's beleaguered transportation industry. The need to retain the investment credit for transportation is so compelling that I am offering an amendment to the tax reform bill to provide for continuation of the credit for regulated transportation.

Continuous improvement in transportation services is essential to our economic well-being. There is no question that, if the tax credit is repealed for transportation, some gain in productivity will be lost, contributing to inefficiency in our transportation system and in the economy at large. This is the only large Nation in the world with a privately owned and run transportation system and we want to keep it that way. But transportation is in trouble, not only in my own State of Nevada but across the whole country.

Airways and airports are congested and require a minimum expenditure of $20 billion in the next 10 years. At the same time, the airlines are having the most severe financial problems in years amid growing demand for air services. They must spend billions of dollars in the next few years for air and ground equipment to accommodate millions of new passengers. Repeal of the 7 percent investment tax credit will virtually wipe out one of the few viable financing mechanisms available to that industry—the tax credit lease. What will happen if the airlines are unable to finance the acquisition of badly needed new, more productive equipment? Certainly fares will have to be increased to meet the cost of inflation. Passengers and shippers will not be accommodated, and the economy will suffer. The only question is how much it will suffer.

As for the railroads, all of us are aware of the constant shortage of boxcars that plagues this industry year after year. The American consumer and our economy are the losers, as well as the railroads. At a time when we are demanding more services from the rails we should not be digging their tax grave.

Our Nation's maritime industry is in perpetual crisis. Not enough U.S. ships are being built. Loss of the investment tax credit can only worsen this very serious situation. Senators should be concerned that 93 percent of U.S. ocean freight is carried in foreign bottoms.

The investment credit has been extremely helpful in enabling the nation's motor carriers of freight to keep abreast of the ever increasing demands for their service by America's shippers.

New industries are increasingly becoming highway oriented and the tens of thousands of communities served only by trucks are increasing in number. Railroads no longer or rarely handle shipments under 6,000 pounds and this also has thrown an additional burden on the highway carriers.

All of this calls for increased capacity, more rolling stock and the modernization of truck fleets. The more than 15,000 regular motor carriers are hard pressed to meet these demands in the face of increased cost of all kinds.

It is apparent that our transportation industries, upon which we all depend so heavily, are not in the best of financial health.

Therefore, Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the investment tax credit repeal provision which will provide the Government and the Nation with far greater benefits than will be lost through diminished tax revenues. It would exempt from repeal the transportation services of all companies regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Maritime Commission, and the Civil Aeronautics Board.

I hope my colleagues agree that such an amendment is profoundly in the national interest.

law, a report on effectiveness and administrative efficiency of the concentrated employment program under title IB of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, St. Louis, Mo., Department of Labor, dated November 20, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A petition, signed by Clifford Luckey, and sundry other citizens of the State of California, praying for the enactment of tax reform legislation; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment:

H.R. 13270. An act to reform the income tax laws (Rept. No. 91-552).

(The remarks of Mr. LONG when he submitted the report appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 3166. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Zito; and

S. 3167. A bill for the relief of Kimoko Ann Duke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he introduced the above bills appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. BROOKE:

S. 3168. A bill for the relief of Daniel H. Robbins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 3169. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 3170. A bill to amend section 8340 of title 5, United States Code, to provide a 5-percent increase in certain annuities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(The remarks of Mr. TYDINGS when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE (for himself, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 3171. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. McGOVERN:

S. 3172. A bill for the relief of Paul Salerno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3173. A bill to extend the time within which claims may be filed for credit with respect to gasoline used on farms; to the Committee on Finance.

(The remarks of Mr. McGOVERN when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. McGOVERN (by request):

S. 3174. A bill for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Mississippi Sioux Indians in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 142, 359-363, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(The remarks of Mr. McGOVERN when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

S. 3166 AND S. 3167—INTRODUCTION OF BILLS FOR THE RELIEF OF GIUSEPPE ZITO AND KIMOKO ANN DUKE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce two private bills. This is not ordinarily the subject of a statement, as under our present rules these are to be introduced only by Members of the Senate. But I introduce two private bills, one for the relief of Giuseppe Zito and another for the relief of Kimoko Ann Duke.

I introduce them publicly because I have had my staff make a careful examination of the merits of this matter, and I am satisfied that they are meritorious, and I introduce them for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills (S. 3166) for the relief of Giuseppe Zito and (S. 3167) for the relief of Kimoko Ann Duke, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3170—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND SECTION 8340 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO CERTAIN ANNUITIES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, it is obvious that the Department of Defense will be announcing numerous reduction in force statements for the balance of this fiscal year, it is imperative that we take every possible step to cushion the actions and reduce the hardships caused by such reductions. It is to that end that I introduce legislation to amend section 8340(b), of title 5 to extend the 5 percent cost-of-living adjustment which was available for a 2-day period and expired October 31, for a period of 60 days after the enactment of legislation I have proposed. I understand the proposal is consistent with recommendations by the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget. Two days is certainly not an adequate period of time to make a decision involving a retirement after a lifetime of service. This was the situation facing prospective retirees on October 29, 1969. It would seem that if we wish career service employees to take an opportunity of early retirement and thus ease the stress of hardship by defense annuitants we should afford these prospective retirees a minimum of 60 days to make the decision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3170) to amend section 8340 of title 5, United States Code, to provide a 5-percent increase in certain annuities, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 3171—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE OMNIBUS CRIME CONTROL AND SAFE STREETS ACT OF 1968

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I am today introducing for myself and Senators BAYH, BIBLE, CANNON, EAGLETON, MCCARTHY, TYDINGS, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and YARBOROUGH a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

On September 23 of this year, the Federal Bureau of Investigation issued its latest crime statistics for the period January to June 1969. These statistics carry the same frightening message carried by other FBI reports in recent years, which is that violent crime and offenses against property continue to increase at an unprecedented rate in the cities, in the suburbs, and in the rural areas of our country. As a group, violent crimes increased 13 percent during this 6-month period when compared to the same period in 1968. Robbery was up 17 percent, forcible rape 15 percent, aggravated assault 10 percent, and murder 8 percent. Crimes against property rose 8 percent as a group. Taken individually, larceny involving amounts of $50 or more increased 17 percent, auto theft was up 9 percent, and burglary 3 percent.

This country is, in fact, fighting two wars today, the one in Southeast Asia and the other right here in this country. This latter conflict is the much talked about, but little acted upon, war on crime. Last year more than 12,000 persons lost their lives as a direct result of this domestic war—victims of a struggle which is in many ways more brutal and more bloody than the one in Vietnam. In 1968 this war, which day by day increases in its intensity, hospitalized 200,000 and produced property losses in excess of $1 billion.

Unlike Vietnam, where there is some hope that an honorable peace may be forthcoming, the situation here at home appears increasingly desperate. The forces of crime appear to be alarmingly close to victory over the forces of peace. If positive action is not taken—and taken soon—a crime crisis of unprecedented proportions will soon surely envelop this Nation.

Happily, we have the tools already at hand to meet effectively the forces of crime and eventually to defeat them. Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 declared that the policy of the Congress is "to assist State and local governments in strengthening and improving law enforcement at every level by national assistance." Such assistance is in the form of planning and action grants to be distributed to the States by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, within the Department of Justice. If intelligently utilized, these grants can serve as an invaluable instrument in the fight against crime.

As originally conceived, these grants were to be distributed directly to those localities where the incidence of crime was highest. The local nature of the law enforcement effort was highlighted by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration

of Justice, in one of the most ambitious investigations of the crime problem ever undertaken. In their report of February 1967, entitled "The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society," the Commission stressed the importance of local participation and authority in the fight against crime.

The House, however, fearful that this direct grant approach would eventually lead to a federally controlled police force, voted for an amendment to title I, which created a block, rather than categorical approach, to grant distribution. By virtue of the House amendment, 85 percent of all available Federal funds would be distributed first to the States and then to the localities.

Here in the Senate, the Judiciary Committee, despite the House amendment, maintained the categorical approach to grant distribution. On the floor this approach was again challenged and ultimately defeated. By a vote of 48 to 29—see page 14771 of the RECORD for May 23, 1968—this body adopted an amendment which paralleled the House amendment in its impact, with the exception of a provision in the Senate version which required that a certain percentage of the funds be channeled automatically by State governments to local governments. This change was viewed as necessary at the time in order to gain the support of those Senators who favored the original categorical approach and who feared that the cities would be slighted if an automatic pass-through provision were not provided. This formula, as developed in the Senate and later accepted by the House, provides that 40 percent of the funds allotted to the States for planning grants and 75 percent of the funds for action grants be funneled directly to units of local government, or combinations of local units, with the remainder going to the State government.

The Law Enforcement Assistant Administration—LEAA—in the Department of Justice has the responsibility of distributing the grant money authorized by Congress. Under the act each State, in order to be eligible for Federal funds, had to establish a State planning agency under the authority of the Governor. A provision for direct grants to localities was put in the act in case any State failed to set up a State planning agency. All States, however, made applications for funds and established planning agencies, thereby preventing local governments from invoking that option. As provided for in the act, 85 percent of the available Federal funds were allocated directly to the States according to their population, with the remaining 15 percent allocated by the LEAA, at its discretion.

To insure that this money would be made available to local governments without long and harmful delays, title I provides that States must apply for planning grants within 6 months after enactment of the statute and that States must then file a comprehensive law enforcement improvement plan within 6 months after approval of their planning grant. Every State jurisdiction was able to meet these deadlines, but not, as we shall see, without some serious damage to the caliber of the plans which were generally devised. The first phase of the program, the planning phase, received $19 million during fiscal year 1969. Another $29 million was appropriated for action grants for activities called for in the initial planning stage.

Several provisions in the act were designed to insure that local governments would not be overlooked in critical matters of planning and funding. In this regard, title I requires that State planning agencies "shall be representative of law enforcement agencies of the State and of the units of general local government within the State." It has been widely assumed that this provision would result in the appointment of public officials who would review the actions of the State's planning staff. The statute also specifically directs the States to take into account "the needs and requests of the units of general local government" and to "encourage local initiative." As shall be pointed out later, the majority of State planning agencies have not done this.

Also, the unfortunate slowness of some States in developing plans for distribution of funds to local governments presents a serious problem to these governments. For it is quite possible that if local governments do not receive planning funds in sufficient time to develop local plans or elements of the State plan, their needs may not be recognized in future action grants, since only the needs covered in the comprehensive State plan will be eligible for action grant assistance.

Moreover, the requirement that the States submit their individual plans within 6 months of their applications for funds has resulted in the formulation of plans which, in many instances, constitute little more than "shopping lists," rather than cohesive, long-range plans. For this reason, it is impossible to tell from many of the plans submitted whether the action programs which will proceed from these plans will further the purposes of the Safe Streets Act.

CRITICISM OF THE SAFE STREETS ACT

What I have said already indicates my belief that all is not well with title I of the Safe Streets Act. Defects in the planning process would appear to threaten seriously the future administration of the action grant program which was formally initiated with the start of this fiscal year. Certainly the ultimate success of title I is dependent upon the effectiveness of the action grants.

These doubts that I voice about the future of the program are shared by a number of organizations which have an immediate interest in the legislation. They are: The National League of Cities—NLC—the U.S. Conference of Mayors—USM—the Urban Coalition and Urban America Inc.; the National Association of Counties—NACO—and the National Governors Conference—GC.

In March of 1969, the National League of Cities published a very well-researched critique of the block grant features of the LEAA program. The study included: First, a comprehensive analysis of 31 State planning grant applications selected at random; second, extensive comments from State municipal leagues and individual cities; and third, several direct contacts with State planning agency directors. This study concluded that:

The Safe Streets Act, as currently administered by LEAA and most of the states, will fail to achieve Congress' primary goal of controlling crime in the streets of urban high crime areas. Instead of focusing dollars on the critical problems of crime in the streets, local planning funds are being dissipated broadly without regard to need and are being used to finance third levels of bureaucracy as a matter of state administrative convenience. Though the original intent of Congress in accepting the approach of block grants to the states was to prevent federal bureaucratic control of local law enforcement activities and to encourage local planing and innovation, state administrative practices would appear to thwart this objective.

The NLC study also noted that the formula for the distribution of planning funds provided that each State, the District of Columbia, and for territories were to receive $100,000 for planning with additional planning funds to be distributed on the basis of population. As a result, planning funds for American Samoa amounted to $3.45 per capita, as compared to only $0.07 each for citizens of California and New York. While allowing that such allocations for planning can perhaps be justified on the theory that there is a certain level of support below which a successful planning operation cannot be maintained, the NLC survey went on to note the disparity between funds made available for planning and action grants:

Although Alaska and Vermont, for example, will receive $118,000 and $128,000 respectively for planning, they will receive only $33,278 and $51,272 respectively for action programs. Such limited funding for post-planning action may retard implementation of an active state program. This may be a particular problem for urban areas in smaller states; these areas have higher crime rates than the state as a whole, but their problems may not receive state level priority either because of limited action resources or the fact that crime is not a pressing statewide issue.

Of the 31 States surveyed by NLC, 28 were developing regional systems to distribute all, or a substantial portion of the planning and action grant funds which the law requires be funneled to localities. It notes that 24 of the 31 States had officially designated a total of 211 regions, each of which will require staffing and separate policy review structures.

Much more importantly, the regional system for allocation of funds is resulting in a fund distribution which favors rural areas over urban, this despite the LEAA guideline which states:

Priorities in funding local planning should be given to the State's major urban and metropolitan areas, to other areas of high crime incidence and potential, and to efforts involving combinations of local units.—LEAA Guide for State Planning Agency Grants, November 1968.

The NLC study then goes on to zero in on what might well be the most serious—and most disturbing—defect in title I, and that is its seeming inability to insure that planning and action grant funds will be concentrated in those areas with the [illegible]

Favoritism of rural areas is most pronounced in those states which repeat the na-

[Roll No. 292]

YEAS—341

Abernethy	Evans, Colo.	Mayne
Adams	Fallon	Meeds
Addabbo	Farbstein	Melcher
Albert	Feighan	Meskill
Anderson, Calif.	Findley	Michel
	Fish	Mikva
Anderson, Ill.	Foley	Miller, Calif.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Ford, Gerald R.	Miller, Ohio
	Foreman	Minish
Arends	Fountain	Mink
Ashbrook	Fraser	Minshall
Ashley	Frelinghuysen	Mize
Aspinall	Frey	Mizell
Ayres	Friedel	Mollohan
Baring	Fulton, Pa.	Monagan
Barrett	Fuqua	Montgomery
Beall, Md.	Galifianakis	Moorhead
Belcher	Gallagher	Morgan
Bennett	Garmatz	Morse
Berry	Gaydos	Mosher
Betts	Gibbons	Murphy, Ill.
Bevill	Gilbert	Murphy, N.Y.
Biaggi	Gonzalez	Myers
Biester	Goodling	Natcher
Bingham	Gray	Nedzi
Blackburn	Green, Oreg.	Nelsen
Boggs	Green, Pa.	Nichols
Boland	Griffiths	Nix
Bow	Grover	Obey
Brademas	Gubser	O'Hara
Brasco	Haley	O'Konski
Bray	Hall	Olsen
Brinkley	Halpern	O'Neill, Mass.
Brooks	Hamilton	Patten
Broomfield	Hammer-schmidt	Pelly
Brotzman		Pepper
Brown, Mich.	Hanley	Perkins
Brown, Ohio	Hanna	Pettis
Broyhill, N.C.	Hansen, Idaho	Philbin
Broyhill, Va.	Harrington	Pike
Buchanan	Harsha	Pirnie
Burke, Fla.	Harvey	Podell
Burke, Mass.	Hastings	Poff
Burleson, Tex.	Hathaway	Pollock
Burlison, Mo.	Hawkins	Preyer, N.C.
Burton, Calif.	Hays	Price, Ill.
Burton, Utah	Hechler, W. Va.	Price, Tex.
Bush	Heckler, Mass.	Pryor, Ark.
Button	Helstoski	Quie
Byrne, Pa.	Hicks	Quillen
Byrnes, Wis.	Hogan	Railsback
Camp	Holifield	Randall
Carter	Horton	Rees
Casey	Hosmer	Reid, Ill.
Cederberg	Howard	Reid, N.Y.
Celler	Hull	Reuss
Chamberlain	Hunt	Rhodes
Chappell	Hutchinson	Riegle
Clancy	Ichord	Rivers
Clark	Jarman	Robison
Clausen, Don H.	Johnson, Calif.	Rodino
	Johnson, Pa.	Roe
Clawson, Del	Jonas	Rogers, Colo.
Clay	Jones, N.C.	Rogers, Fla.
Cleveland	Jones, Tenn.	Rooney, N.Y.
Cohelan	Karth	Rooney, Pa.
Collier	Kastenmeier	Rosenthal
Collins	Kazen	Roth
Colmer	Kee	Roudebush
Conte	Keith	Roybal
Conyers	Kleppe	Ruppe
Coughlin	Kluczynski	Ruth
Cramer	Koch	Ryan
Culver	Kyros	St Germain
Cunningham	Landgrebe	St. Onge
Daddario	Langen	Sandman
Daniel, Va.	Latta	Satterfield
Daniels, N.J.	Lipscomb	Saylor
Davis, Ga.	Lloyd	Schadeberg
Davis, Wis.	Long, Md.	Schneebeli
de la Garza	Lowenstein	Schwengel
Delaney	Lujan	Scott
Dellenback	Lukens	Sebelius
Denney	McClory	Shriver
Dennis	McCloskey	Skubitz
Dent	McClure	Slack
Derwinski	McCulloch	Smith, Calif.
Devine	McDade	Smith, N.Y.
Dickinson	McDonald, Mich.	Snyder
Dingell		Springer
Donohue	McEwen	Stafford
Dowdy	McKneally	Staggers
Downing	McMillan	Stanton
Dulski	Madden	Steed
Duncan	Mahon	Steiger, Ariz.
Dwyer	Mailliard	Steiger, Wis.
Eckhardt	Mann	Stubblefield
Edmondson	Marsh	Stuckey
Edwards, Ala.	Martin	Sullivan
Edwards, Calif.	Mathias	Symington
Erlenborn	Matsunaga	Taft
Eshleman	May	Talcott
Taylor	Watkins	Wold
Teague, Calif.	Watson	Wolff
Teague, Tex.	Watts	Wright
Thompson, Ga.	Weicker	Wyatt
Thomson, Wis.	Whalen	Wydler
Tiernan	White	Wylie
Tunney	Whitehurst	Wyman
Ullman	Whitten	Yates
Van Deerlin	Wiggins	Yatron
Vander Jagt	Williams	Young
Vanik	Wilson, Bob	Zablocki
Vigorito	Wilson, Charles H.	Zion
Waldie		Zwach
Wampler	Winn	

NAYS—1

Ottinger

NOT VOTING—90

Abbitt	Flood	MacGregor
Adair	Flowers	Mills
Alexander	Flynt	Morton
Anderson, Tenn.	Ford, William D.	Moss
		O'Neal, Ga.
Andrews, Ala.	Fulton, Tenn.	Passman
Annunzio	Gettys	Patman
Bell, Calif.	Giaimo	Pickle
Blanton	Goldwater	Poage
Blatnik	Griffin	Powell
Bolling	Gross	Pucinski
Brock	Gude	Purcell
Brown, Calif.	Hagan	Rarick
Cabell	Hansen, Wash.	Reifel
Caffery	Hébert	Roberts
Cahill	Henderson	Rostenkowski
Carey	Hungate	Scherle
Chisholm	Jacobs	Scheuer
Conable	Jones, Ala.	Shipley
Corbett	King	Sikes
Corman	Kirwan	Sisk
Cowger	Kuykendall	Smith, Iowa
Dawson	Kyl	Stephens
Diggs	Landrum	Stokes
Dorn	Leggett	Stratton
Edwards, La.	Lennon	Thompson, N.J.
Eilberg	Long, La.	Udall
Esch	McCarthy	Utt
Evins, Tenn.	McFall	Waggonner
Fascell	Macdonald, Mass.	Whalley
Fisher		Widnall

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Waggonner with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Conable.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Scherle.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Bell of California.
Mr. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Eilberg with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Griffin with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Gude.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. King.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Gross.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. McFall with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Udall.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Anderson of Tennessee.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Alexander.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Fascell.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Flynt.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Flowers.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Sisk.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Roberts.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Pickle.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Leggett.
Mr. Caffery with Mr. Jacobs.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Hungate.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Kirwan.
Mr. Brown of California with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Powell.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Landrum.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Stokes.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Stephens.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Dawson.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 14227, ADJUSTMENTS OF RETIRED PAY TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONSUMER PRICE INDEX

Mr. MATSUNAGA, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res, 726, Rept. No. 91–692), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 726

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14227) to amend section 1401a(b) of title 10, United States Code, relating to adjustments of retired pay to reflect changes in Consumer Price Index. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 726 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House now consider House Resolution 726?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the House agreed to consider House Resolution 726.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Hawaii is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general

debate for consideration of H.R. 14227 to provide military retirees with an improved formula for future adjustments in their military retired pay.

The purpose of H.R. 14227 is to modify the existing statutory formula under which military retired pay is increased upward to reflect changes in the cost of living.

The bill, as amended, is designed to insure that military retirees will have the same benefit afforded Federal civil service retirees with respect to the 1 percent added increase in cost of living adjustments provided by Public Law 91–93, which was enacted on October 20 of this year.

Federal civil service retirees received a cost-of-living adjustment on November 1, 1969 which included the 1-percent add-on. This bill would provide that military retirees will similarly benefit by this 1-percent add-on retroactive to the same date. Passage of this legislation will simply mean equity for the military retiree.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this resolution in order that H.R. 14227 may be considered.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. QUILLEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) has ably stated, this resolution provides for the consideration of H.R. 14227 under an open rule, with 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of the bill is to bring the formula covering retirement pay for the military into line with recent amendments to the formula used by the Civil Service Commission for civilian retirees.

Under the existing formula, whenever the Consumer Price Index increases by 3 percent over the index base, and remains at or above that level for a period of 3 consecutive months, military retired pay is increased on the 1st day of the third month following the 3-month period by the highest percentage of increase attained during that period.

The bill adds to this formula an additional 1 percent upward adjustment with each such cost-of-living increase. The reason for this is to make up for the time lag built into the formula. This same legislation was recently signed into law (91–339) for civil service retirees.

The Department of Defense supports the legislation and estimates the cost for 1 year at about $27,000,000.

The bill was reported unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time but I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASING PER DIEM ALLOWANCE FOR MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES

Mr. MATSUNAGA, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 727, Rept. No. 61–693), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 727

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 944) to amend section 404(d) of title 37, United States Code, by increasing the maximum rates of per diem allowance and reimbursement authorized, under certain circumstances, to meet the actual expenses of travel. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 727, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House now consider House Resolution 727?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the House agreed to consider House Resolution 727.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Hawaii is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 944 to increase per diem allowance for members of the uniformed services.

The purpose of H.R. 944, as amended, is to increase the maximum per diem in lieu of subsisistence and actual expense reimbursement to the same levels now enjoyed by the civilian Government employees, that is to $25 for the per diem allowance and to $40 for the actual expense reimbursement. At the present time, the maximum per diem is $16 per day and the actual expense reimbursement is $30 per day.

H.R. 944 would provide that all Government employees, military and civilian, will be treated equally.

It is estimated that the additional annual cost resulting from the increases will be approximately $80.8 million.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this resolution in order that H.R. 944 may be considered.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. QUILLEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) has ably stated, this resolution provides for the consideration of H.R. 944 under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of the bill is to increase the maximum per diem permitted to members of the uniformed services from $16 per day to $25 per day and the maximum amount which may be reimbursed when actual expenses are paid from $30 per day to $40 per day.

Public Law 91–114, recently enacted, raises the civilian Government employee allowances to $25 per day on a per diem basis and provides that when actual expenses are paid out, the top figure reimbursable is $40 per day. The bill proposes to bring the uniformed services in line with these recent amendments to statutory law covering civilian employees.

The Department of Defense estimates the annual cost resulting from this increase will be approximately $80,800,000. The Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, but I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 944) to amend section 404(d) of title 37, United States Code, by increasing the maximum rates of per diem allowance and reimbursement authorized, under certain circumstances, to meet the actual expenses of travel, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be conisdered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 944

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 404(d) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out "$16" and "$30", respectively, and inserting in place thereof "$25" and "$35".

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 5, strike out "$20" and insert "$25" and strike out "$35" and insert "$40".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 944 is designed to amend section 404(d) of title 37, United States Code, by increasing the maximum rates of per diem allowance and actual expense reimbursement authorized to meet the travel expenses of service members within the contiguous 48 States and the District of Columbia.

H.R. 944 as originally introduced would have increased the per diem allowance from $16 to $20 and would have increased the actual expense reimbursement allowance from $30 to $35. However, Public Law 91–114, which was en-

acted recently, raises the civilian government employee allowances higher than those contemplated for the military under H.R. 944. As a result, civilians are now entitled to a per diem allowance of $25 and an actual expense reimbursement of $40. Figures on current costs of lodging and meals were presented to the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives by the Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget during the hearings on the civilian bill. These figures caused that committee to conclude that a per diem allowance of $25 and a reimbursement allowance of $40 were necessary.

In light of these findings and in order that all Government employees, military and civilian, would be treated equally, the Committee on Armed Services amended H.R. 944 to increase the per diem allowance for military personnel to the same levels now received by their civilian counterparts, namely the bill's allowance was raised from $20 to $25 and the actual expense reimbursement was raised from $35 to $40. Based upon these increased allowances, the annual cost of H.R. 944 as amended would be $80.8 million. This dollar requirement can be financed within the revised Department of Defense budget for fiscal year 1970. The Department of Defense recommends enactment of the bill at levels that correspond to the civilian allowances. The Bureau of the Budget interposes no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJUSTMENTS OF RETIRED PAY TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONSUMER PRICE INDEX

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 14227) to amend section 1401a(b) of title 10, United States Code, relating to adjustments of retired pay to reflect changes in Consumer Price Index, and ask that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 14227

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of section 1401a(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "If the Secretary determines that, for three consecutive months, the amount of the increase is at least 3 per centum over the base index, the retired pay and retainer pay of members and former members of the armed forces who become entitled to that pay before the first day of the third calendar month beginning after the end of those three months shall, except as provided in subsection (c), be increased, effective on that day, by the per centum obtained by adding 1 per centum and the highest per centum of increase in the index during those months, adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 per centum."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, after line 5, add the following new section:

"SEC. 2. The provisions of this Act become effective on October 31, 1969."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

(Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to modify the existing statutory formula under which military retired pay is increased upward so as to more adequately reflect changes in the cost of living.

EXPLANATION

Under the existing formula for adjusting military retired pay, whenever the Consumer Price Index—CPI—increases by 3 percent over the previous base index and remains at or above that level for a peirod of 3 consecutive months, military retired pay is increased on the 1st day of the third month following that 3-month period by the highest percentage of increase attained during that period.

This formula was designed by the Congress as a device to protect the purchasing power of military retired pay.

A similar formula is utilized by the Civil Service Commission to protect the purchasing power of retired Federal civil service employees. However, the formula for civil service retirees has recently been improved with the enactment of Public Law 91–93, October 20, 1969, by attempting to compensate for an evident deficiency in this formula.

Briefly, the Congress has provided that whenever an adjustment in Federal civil service employee's retired pay is effected, in addition to the percentage increase dictated by the CPI change, there will be added a 1-percent increase to compensate for the lag in the application of this formula.

Thus, since the established formula required a 4-percent increase in civil service retired pay effective November 1, 1969, there was also added an additional 1 percent as a result of Public Law 91–93, with the result that the net increase for civil service retirees was 5 percent.

Since military retirees are confronted with the same problem as civil service retirees, Mr. RIVERS introduced the legislation which would extend this improved formula to military retirees as well.

EXECUTIVE BRANCH POSITION

The administration has advised the Committee on Armed Services that it supports enactment of this bill.

FISCAL DATA

The cost of a 1-percent increase in military retired pay for 1 year will be approximately $27,000,000.

COMMITTEE ACTION

The Committee on Armed Services unanimously approved this bill with an amendment, which would make it effective on the same date as the similar provision for civil service retirees—November 1, 1969.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 14227.

The purpose of this bill is to grant military retirees the same cost-of-living adjustments now afforded Federal civil service retirees.

There was sound reason for adjusting the cost-of-living formula for Federal civil service retirees, and the same reasons apply with equal force to the bill now before the House.

In view of recent history of the rate of increase in cost of living and the rate which will pertain in the foreseeable future, the adjustment authorized in this bill will not fully compensate the retiree for the cost-of-living increase, nor is it intended to do so. It will, however, help to close the gap without adding to the inflationary pressures which cause the cost-of-living increase.

By passing this legislation we keep the faith with our retired military personnel by giving them the same consideration which we have already properly given to Federal civil service retirees.

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, when Congress enacted Public Law 85–422 in 1958, it departed from a principle that had been practiced for almost 100 years: That of basing military retired pay on military active duty pay rates.

This legislation was followed in 1963 by Public Law 88–132 linking military retirement pay to the consumer price index. The practical result of this legislation was to introduce further confusion and inequality into the computation of retirement pay for military personnel. Members on the retired rolls or those due for retirement within the next few years almost without exception entered active service and served their careers under a more favorable retirement system.

Persons entering the armed services during that period had every reason to believe that the Government would carry out its end of the bargain by continuing to provide a favorable retirement system. Certainly if these retirement benefits were to be reduced, provisions should have been made to protect the equity of those individuals who had entered the service under that system. Ironically, the action taken by Congress in enacting the two aforementioned public laws occurred during the very period that social security benefits and private pension plans were becoming much more liberal and active duty military pay was being increased.

Under the "cost-of-living" formula, the older retirees, who have less opportunity to supplement their retired pay by outside employment, and whose financial needs may well be greater, will continue to see their income decline in relation to their younger comrades. Such lowered standards at once broke faith with those persons on the active lists as to their own treatment in the years to come. Certainly the lowered standard of compensation arbitrarily imposed upon those already retired can cause little reason for hope for better treatment for those due to retire in the future.

I believe that military people, both active and retired, who entered the mili-

tary service prior to June 1, 1958, when the recomputation principle was precipitiously suspended, have a moral right to have their retired pay computed no less favorably than was provided by law when they undertook the obligations of a military career in anticipation of such benefits.

Whatever the merits of H.R. 14277, I feel that the terms of my proposed legislation, H.R. 310 will improve the system by removing the inequities which I have just cited. In addition, it has the added attraction of ultimately reducing the cost to the Federal Government by elliminating the application of the legislation to those persons who entered the service after the system had been changed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the two bills just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATION ACTION NEEDED TO IMPROVE HOUSING MARKET

(Mr. BARRETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, in the Wall Street Journal of Wednesday, November 19, I saw two articles, side by side, which were of particular interest to me as chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing.

The first of these articles was captioned "Housing Starts in Month Fell 12 Percent, Most This Year." A reading of this article simply reinforces what all of us already know and have known for some time—that the housing industry continues to be in trouble—in deep trouble.

The second of these articles offers what I think is a glimmer of hope for the housing industry. Preston Martin, the new and dynamic Chairman of the Home Loan Bank Board announced that newly instituted actions will make more than $5.3 billion available in additional funds in 1970. This is a most welcomed piece of news.

But, Mr. Speaker, there was something in this latter article that causes me some concern.

There is nobody in the Congress who has a greater respect for the Bank Board than I. It has done in the past, is doing now, and will in the future, I know, continue to do an outstanding job in helping provide housing for all of our people. The Bank Board is offering to buy some $200 million in mortgage paper which will originate on HUD-subsidized housing projects. What concerns me, Mr. Speaker, is that the administration, in pushing forward in this area, is not really cognizant of what we in the Congress have intended, or if cognizant, it chooses to ignore our mandate.

One of the more important features of the Housing Act of 1968 was section 804 relating to mortgage-backed securities. In our report on the pending Housing and Urban Development Act of 1969, we said:

> When this legislation (i.e. the 1968 Act) was considered last year, the Committee understood that FNMA, using its experience and contacts in the capital market, would be the first issuer of these securities in order to establish their acceptability to potential investors. Other issuers then would be able to take advantage of FNMA's experience and expertise. This still seems to be a sound plan, and would seem to represent a reasonable procedure to initiate and establish a reliable market for this type of security.

It is unclear, at this point, Mr. Speaker, exactly what type of issue the Bank Board is contemplating. If it is the bond type mortgage-backed security. I would certainly expect that the administration will heed the words of our committee and will use that facility—FNMA—which has been ready and willing for some little time and able to move in this area.

If the security involved is not a bond type mortgage-backed security, then I think we must again ask the administration how much longer will it take for it to implement this mortgage-backed security program which still offers so much potential for the tapping of large sums of money so sorely needed by the housing industry.

The housing situation is daily growing more acute, and some 15 or 16 months, Mr. Speaker, seems to be long enough for the administration to perfect its regulations on this section of the law which still offers much promise.

AND I STILL DREAM ABOUT IT

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, every day for the past week, we have seen new evidence establishing that war crimes have been committed by members of our Armed Forces in Vietnam. A horrendous tragedy took place in the village of Songmy where Vietnamese civilians, men, women, and babes in arms, were massacred by American Army personnel.

If we did not know it before, we know it now, that the ability to commit war crimes is not restricted to the Germans. War brings out the beast in man. Every nation is capable of committing the kind of atrocity that took place in this small Vietnamese village.

War crimes in our lifetime have been committed by the Soviet Union which slaughtered tens of thousands of innocent Poles and other peoples in Eastern Europe; the Dutch committed similar atrocities in Indonesia before they left those islands; the French perpetrated comparable outrages in Algeria before they vacated that country. There is a litany of names which would include country after country, guilty of atrocities, when one nation sought to subjugate the people of another land. These war crimes are always committed in the name of freedom, liberty, and self-defense.

Almost every country sitting in judgment at Nuremburg has a historical record of having committed atrocities. There were some who made this point when the Nuremburg trials were being conducted, and some said that because there were others who had committed and would commit other atrocities that those Germans who had committed them in World War II ought not to be punished. I did not agree with that point of view then, nor do I now. Instead, we ought to make certain, indeed pledge, that whoever commits atrocities from whatever country, including our own, must and will be brought to trial. And that we pledge ourselves to evolve a worldwide rule of law and the mechanism to enforce it which will seek out those who violate that law and punish them.

It must have come as a shock to many Americans to learn that our people are as capable of committing these most abhorrent acts as were the Nazis of Germany. It is not enough to hang our heads in shame—we must do more. Man carries within him the most base animal instincts, as well as the divine spirit. When a man personally, or under color of governmental authority, permits those base bestial instincts to govern his conduct and commits acts which, as a result of the Nuremburg trials, now constitute acts, universally accepted as war crimes, such a man or men must be punished.

Whether war crimes are committed by North Vietnamese at Hue or by U.S. soldiers in Songmy, justice requires that those who perpetrate them be tried.

The confession of one of our young soldiers, Paul Meadlo, who participated in the killing of men, women, and babies at Songmy, is a compelling statement and should be read by all of our colleagues. It follows:

TRANSCRIPT OF INTERVIEW OF VIETNAM WAR VETERAN ON HIS ROLE IN ALLEGED MASSACRE OF CIVILIANS AT SONGMY

(NOTE.—Following is a transcript of an interview with Paul Medlo, Vietnam veteran, by Mike Wallace on the Columbia Broadcasting System Radio Network last night.)

MEADLO. Captain Medinas had us all in a group, and oh, he briefed us, and I can't remember all the briefing.

WALLACE. How many of them were you? A. Well, with the mortar platoon, I'd say there'd be about 65—65 people, but the mortar platoon wasn't with us. And I'd say the mortar platoon had about 20—25—about 25 people in the mortar platoon. So we didn't have the whole company in the Pinkville, no we didn't.

Q. There weren't about 40 45. . . . A. . . . right . . .

Q. —that took part in all of this? A. Right.

Q. Now you took off from your base camp— A. . . . yes—Dolly.

Q. . . . Dolly. At what time? A. I wouldn't know what time it was . . .

Q. . . . in the early morning . . . A. . . . In the early morning. It was—it would have been a long time ago.

or (B) after he has received outpatient hospital diagnostic services, if, after reviewing the findings revealed by such services, his physician and the hospital from which he received such services certify (not later than 7 days after the termination of such services) that he is in immediate need of extended care services, and if he is admitted to an extended care facility within 14 days after the date on which his need for extended care services was so certified."

S. 1218—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO IMPROVE PAYMENT FORMULA FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH INSURANCE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide that the Government contribution to the cost of Federal employee health insurance plans shall not be less than 38 percent thereof.

From the beginning of the health insurance program in 1960 until 1967, employees paid the full cost of each increase in the insurance premiums. In 1966, Congress provided that the Government should pay some of the increased cost of the insurance by raising the Government's dollar contribution to the plans.

This dollar increase, which went into effect in 1967, brought the Government's share of the cost of the health insurance up to 38 percent for high-option coverage.

Unfortunately, stepping up the Government's dollar contribution in this fashion provides only a temporary solution to the problem of increasing insurance costs.

This year, again, health insurance premiums have been raised. There is no provision in the law for an automatic increase in the Government's share of the premium. The employees are carrying the entire cost of the increase, and the Government's share now amounts to only about 27 percent of the total premium.

I propose, Mr. President, that we fix the Government's share at 38 percent of the cost of the health insurance plans. Then, with any future increase in the premiums, the dollar amount of the Government's contribution will automatically be proportionately increased.

For all Federal employee health insurance programs, the Government now pays $1.62 if the enrollment is for self only, and $3.94 for self and family, plus administrative expenses—except as provided in subsection (b) of section 8906 of title 5, U.S.C., which fixes the Government share at 50 percent for plans for which the biweekly cost is less than twice the dollar amounts mentioned above. My bill would retain those dollar amounts but provide that the Government will contribute either those dollar amounts or 38 percent of the subscription charge of the plan, whichever is the greater.

Basically, this would guarantee that no matter what his plan or how much it may increase in cost in the future, a Federal employee will not pay more than 62 percent of the cost of his health insurance program. Any coverage for which the Government's share is now more than 38 percent will not be altered by this proposal.

Mr. President, this year's increases in the premiums for Government employee health insurance amount to substantial additional payroll deductions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table giving increases in biweekly payroll deductions for the three health insurance programs available to Federal employees in this area be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INCREASES IN BIWEEKLY HEALTH INSURANCE DEDUCTIONS, 1969

	Self only	Self and family
Aetna:		
High option	$1.62	$4.01
Low option	.65	1.49
Blue Cross/Blue Shield:		
High option	1.09	2.66
Low option	.08	.14
Group Health:		
High option	.43	1.13
Low option	.31	.80

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, although in 1966 we approved a Government employee cost-sharing plan where the Government paid 38 percent to the employee's 62 percent, this year's increases have change the percentages to 27 percent and 73 percent respectively.

In recommending to the Senate the 1966 increase in the Government's share, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported that—

> Congress did not intend for the employee to pay a disproportionate share of the cost of the program. This is not characteristic of private enterprise and should not be followed in the Federal program.

And yet, only 3 years later, the employees are paying significantly more than 62 percent which the committee then recommended and which Congress approved.

In addition, Mr. President, I would like to remind my colleagues that last year we provided for precisely the same conversion I now propose—from a fixed dollar contribution to a fixed percentage of cost—for the Federal employees' life insurance program. Rather than having to repeatedly increase the dollar amount of the Government's contribution to the life insurance program, we included a provision in the Civil Service pay bill which fixed the Government's share at 33⅓ percent.

In the interests of efficiency and fairness to Federal employees, I urge that we follow up that sensible change in the payment formula with the comparable change I propose here. So that we need not come back each time health insurance costs go up, and so that Federal employes will not have to shoulder a disproportionate share of those increases between the time they go into effect and the time Congress can provide redress, I move that we change the system of computing the Government's share from a fixed dollar amount to a fixed percentage. And furthermore, I suggest that a reasonable percentage for the Government to contribute is 38 percent.

Mr. President, I ask that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1218) to provide that the Government contribution to the cost of Federal employee health insurance plans shall not be less than 38 percent thereof, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1218

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 8906 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "is $1.62 if the enrollment is for self alone or $3.94 if the enrollment is for self and family." and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "is the greater of the following:

"(1) $1.62 if the enrollment is for self alone or $3.94 if the enrollment is for self or family; or

"(2) 38 percent of the subscription charge for the plan."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the sixtieth day following the date of enactment.

S. 1223—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE ISSUANCE OF A SPECIAL SERIES OF POSTAGE STAMPS IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I rise to introduce a bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs. I am sure that the Members of the Senate are well acquainted with the work of this outstanding organization, but I would like to review some of the highlights of its 50-year history.

In 1917, Secretary of War Newton Baker appealed to the women's colleges and to the YWCA to organize business and professional women as a source of qualified women for the war effort. This initiative led to the founding in July 1919 of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs. The goals of the federation were to elevate the status of business and professional women, promote their interests, and foster a spirit of cooperation among them.

The national federation has grown until today its membership numbers close to 200,000. It has federations in each of the 50 States, with approximately 3,800 local clubs. An international federation was formed in 1930, and today represents almost 40 countries.

The national federation carries on many significant activities. Particularly noteworthy are the annual Congress of Career Women Leaders, and the Business and Professional Women's Foundation located here in Washington, dedicated to furthering research relating to the status of business and professional women.

Mr. President, I feel that the 50th anniversary of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs is an event worthy of commemoration, and for that reason I am introducing a bill providing for a special commemorative stamp. I have today also written to Postmaster General Blount, urging that his Department take favorable action on the national federation's request for such a stamp.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1223) to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, introduced by Mr. MATHIAS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.1224—INTRODUCTION OF BILL RESTORNG LIMITED COMMUNITY WORK AND TRAINING PROVISIONS TO FEDERAL LAW

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I introduced a bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to permit States to continue, under certain circumstances, community work and training programs for individuals receiving aid to families with dependent children under State plans established pursuant to such title. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be received and appropriately referred.

The bill would restore limited community work and training provisions to section 409 of the Social Security Act which will help States assure that job training is available to every welfare recipient who might benefit from it.

Under present law the work incentive program has replaced community work and training. However, there are some geographical areas where work incentive "slots" will not be available and in some instances there may not be as many "slots" under the work incentive program as the State could make available if community work and training continued in effect.

Some States, such as Oregon, have conducted highly successful work training programs during the 5 years, 1962 through 1967, that the Community Work and Training Law existed. Thousands of Oregonians received on-the-job experience that enabled them to leave welfare rolls in favor of self-support. I am confident that this experience was shared by other States.

When the law was changed eliminating community work and training, some States, which had not yet had an opportunity to implement the work incentive program, found themselves with no mandatory work program for recipients. Local administrators commented that the lack of mandatory work requirements weakened the entire program. Men who had formerly taken pride in participating in projects that benefited the entire community showed reluctance to expend so much effort when others could do nothing at all and continue to receive their assistance grants.

Community work and training has given many communities new parks, road improvements, and other assets their regular budgets would not have covered. These highly visible projects have been tangible proof to the community and to the recipients themselves that these recipients wanted to work and to contribute something meaningful to community life if only opportunities were made available.

The proposed legislation would permit States to reestablish community work and training programs for those recipients who live in parts of the State where there is no work incentive program operating or for whom there are no work incentive openings available at a given time. Enactment of this legislation will mean that all welfare recipients, regardless of where they live or how many others are in similar circumstances, will have the same opportunities for work experience and will be subject to the same requirements.

The proposed change would not keep public welfare in the work program business permanently. As the work incentive program grows to the point where it covers all appropriate recipients, community work and training would be automatically phased out. Until that time, the change would be a step toward equity and opportunity for those who receive public assistance.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1224) to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to permit States to continue, under certain circumstances, community work and training programs for individuals receiving aid to families with dependent children under State plans established pursuant to such title, introduced by Mr. HATFIELD, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1224

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 409 of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c)(1) Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this section or the provisions of section 204(c)(2) of the Social Security Amendments of 1967, the preceding provisions of this section shall apply with respect to expenditures with respect to a dependent child or relative with whom such child is living (as specified in section 406(a)) only if such child or relative is residing in an area of the State—

"(i) in which there is not in operation a work incentive program established pursuant to part C, or

"(ii) in which there is in operation such a work incentive program but, because of limitations on the number of individuals who can be accepted under such programs, all individuals referred to such program under section 402(a) cannot be accepted to participate therein.

"(2) Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed to relieve any State of the requirements imposed by section 402(a) with respect to referral of individuals to a work incentive program established under part C."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall be applicable only with respect to calendar quarters commencing after the date of enactment of this Act.

S. 1229 AND S. 1230—INTRODUCTION OF BILLS RELATING TO TREATMENT OF INDIAN TRIBES UNDER TERMS OF CRIME CONTROL AND SAFE STREETS ACT OF 1968 AND JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION AND CONTROL ACT OF 1968

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, on behalf of Mr. METCALF, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MANSFIELD, and myself, I am pleased to introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills, S. 1229, amending the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-351) and S. 1230, amending the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-445).

These amendments simply provide that Indian tribes are eligible to receive direct Federal assistance under the anti-crime programs established by the two acts. The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act amendment requires that the tribe "perform law-enforcement functions." The need for such treatment arises from the unique legal status of Indian lands within our system of government.

In general, States at the present time do not have jurisdiction over criminal offenses committed on Indian reservations by or against Indians, or over civil causes of action which arise on Indian reservations between Indians or as to which Indians are parties. However, Public Law 280, 83d Congress, as amended, granted to six States—Alaska, California, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, and Wisconsin—with certain exceptions, jurisdiction with respect to criminal offenses and civil causes of action which arise in Indian country within such States.

When the omnibus crime control and safe streets legislation was initially drafted, Indian tribes were inadvertently omitted from coverage under title I. The Senate corrected this oversight by adopting an amendment proposed by Senator Hayden and other Senators which made it clear that Indian tribes were among the local units of government eligible to receive assistance under the new law. Indian tribes were thus made eligible for Federal law enforcement grants on the same basis as other municipalities.

Similarly, the inadvertent omission of Indian tribes from coverage under the Juvenile Prevention and Control Act was corrected, by amendment, thus making Indian tribes eligible recipients of grant funds under the act.

What was accomplished by these corrections, however, was lost in part when the block grant approach was ultimately adopted. Both acts establish a State agency for administration of the programs within the State. In those States which do not have jurisdiction over Indian tribes, it is unrealistic to support the State agency will make appropriate provision for juvenile delinquency and crime control problems on Indian reservations within their borders.

The amendments we offer today insure that the applications of concerned Indian tribes will be placed on an equal

items specifically excluded from gross income) is amended by redesignating section 121 as section 122, and by inserting after section 120 the following new section:

"SEC. 121. Retirement annuities paid by the United States or any agency thereof.

"Gross income does not include the first $5,000 received during any tax year as civil service retirement annuity from the United States or any agency thereof, after the full amount of the annuitant's contribution to the civil service retirement and disability fund has been paid to the annuitant."

SEC. 2. The table of sections for part III of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out.

"SEC. 121. Cross references to other Acts" and inserting in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 121. Retirement annuities paid by the United States or any agency thereof under Federal Retirement Acts.

"SEC. 122. Cross references to other Acts."

SEC. 3. Section 37(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to limitation on retirement income) is amended by striking out "or at the end of subparagraph (B), by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D), and by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

"(C) under Federal Retirement Acts, or".

SEC. 4. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

S. 423. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide minimum annuities for employee annuitants and spouse survivor annuitants; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8339, Title V, United States Code, is amended by adding the following subsection (l) after subsection (k) thereof.

SECTION 1. No annuity under this section shall be less than $200 per month for an annuitant with a spouse and/or dependents, or $100 per month for an annuitant with neither spouse nor dependents.

SEC. 2. Section 8341, Title V, United States Code, is amended by adding the following subsection (g) after subsection (f) thereof:

(g) No annuity under this section shall be less than $200 per month for a spouse survivor annuitant with one or more dependents, or $100 per month for a spouse survivor annuitant without dependents.

SEC. 3. This Act shall take effect on the first day of the third month following its enactment.

SEC. 4. The provisions of section 8348(g), Title V, United States Code, shall not apply with respect to benefits resulting from the enactment of this Act.

S. 424, S. 425, AND S. 426—INTRODUCTION OF BILLS TO AMEND THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT AND THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT OF 1947

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and other Senators, I introduce, for appropriate reference, three bills to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947.

These bills are the same as those introduced by me in the 90th Congress. The first bill would amend the national emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act to provide for dissolution of injunctions only upon the settlement of disputes. Under existing law, injunctions are limited to 80 days. The national interest must be protected as long as is necessary. I may point out that unions will, of course, retain the right to strike a particular plant or even a segment of an industry. The injunction, as under existing law, can be enforced only where the strikes are so broad as to jeopardize the national health and welfare.

A second bill would amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to require a Board-conducted election in all representation cases. Thus this bill would prevent voluntary recognition of a union by an employer, a practice which has led to many abuses. I have always believed that it is the right of the worker, and not his boss or a few union advocates, to cast his ballot secretly for or against union representation.

Mr. President, the third bill would amend the National Labor Relations Act by prohibiting the levying by unions of fines against employees for exercising their rights under the act. Under this proposal, for example, a union could not fine an employee for exceeding production quotas set by the unions, crossing union picket lines, filing decertification petitions, nor for testifying in Board proceedings against a union. It seems to me that unions cannot be regarded in the same light as private voluntary associations, which are and should be free to impose on its members whichever rules it chooses. This bill will carry out the intent of Congress that the rights given to unions carry commensurate responsibility and obligations on unions to act in the public interest and in the interests of their members.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. FANNIN (for himself and other Senators), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

By Mr. FANNIN (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware):

S. 424. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to prohibit the levying by labor organizations of fines against employees for exercising rights under such act or for certain other activities.

By Mr. FANNIN (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware):

S. 425. A bill to amend the national emergency provisions of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, so as to provide for dissolution of injunctions thereunder only upon settlement of disputes.

By Mr. FANNIN (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware):

S. 426. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to require a Board-conducted election in representation cases.

S. 434—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO REAUTHORIZE THE RIVERTON RECLAMATION PROJECT

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I introduce, in behalf of myself and my Wyoming colleague (Mr. HANSEN), a bill to reauthorize the Riverton reclamation project.

This measure is not a new one, Mr. President, and, in fact, hearings were held on similar legislation in the 90th Congress by the Interior Committee. It is, however, badly needed legislation which will, among other things, protect a considerable investment of money, time, and dedication. It represents the best thoughts I have heard from all quarters on how to resurrect the deteriorating Third Division of the Riverton project, which was bought back from its former settlers a few seasons ago and has since been leased to farmers of the successful Midvale Irrigation District, who have continued to make the lands produce.

The men on these lands have proven they can work them profitably and the Midvale district has shown it can handle the operation and maintenance of the old third division lands. This bill, then, would put their operation on solid footing by incorporating nearly 9,000 acres of the former third division into their operation, reauthorizing the entire Riverton unit as a part of the Missouri River Basin project, and providing for a single repayment contract with the Government.

Mr. President, the Riverton Ranger is a newspaper which advocates this bill, so vital to its own community. It has editorially supported the measure, and in an editorial published December 30, 1969, it summed up the need. I ask unanimous consent that that editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 434) to reauthorize the Riverton extension unit, Missouri River Basin project, to include therein the entire Riverton Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McGEE (for himself and Mr. HANSEN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The editorial presented by Mr. McGEE is as follows:

DETERIORATION

Congress should enact, early in the session, the Riverton project reauthorization bill. The needs for the bill cry for prompt action.

The most immediate one is the necessity of returning the Third Division farms to private ownership. Leased out on a year to year basis since the government brought out the Third Division settlers, the 8800 acres in Third Division continue to produce, but the buildings, the fences, the weed control and the general maintenance and upbuilding of the farm suffers.

Deterioration is the word that best describes what's happening in Third Division while the Midvale farmers wait for action by Congress on the Riverton project bill. The lessees have proved the feasibility of the area. Midvale, through its experience, has proved it can handle the operation and maintenance of the Third Division right along with their own lands in the Second Division of the Riverton project.

Progress has been steady, if slow, toward such action by Congress. Hearings have been held by both the House and Senate on the bill. There's been a tour of the premises. The Central Arizona Project, long hailed as the

stumbling block impeding action, is now out of the way.

Wyoming's Congressmen McGee, Hansen and Wold present a united front with promises to reintroduce the bill early in the session.

Colorado Congresman Wayne Aspinall is familiar with the needs of Riverton project.

Our request is urgent. It's irresponsible to defer action longer and contribute to further deterioration of Third Division farms. The bills should be passed. The first priority under its several phases should be to sell these farms to farmers who know how to run them and will reverse the tragic downward trend that's been inevitable with the one year leases.

S. 436, S. 437, AND S. 438—INTRODUCTION OF BILLS ON FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' LEGISLATION

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, during my years in the Senate I have been very much concerned with the problems of people who work for the Federal Government. We want to attract the most competent and best trained people possible for Government service. Once we have attracted them, we want to hold them in their jobs. One of the most important incentives to Government careers is a fair retirement system.

Our present civil service system is one of the best in the world, but it has some glaring weaknesses. Some of these weaknesses grow out of arbitrary action taken by the Congress. For many years, when changes were made in the retirement system, they were made retroactive to provide benefits for those previously retired commensurate with the benefits granted to those who would retire in the future. However, in the last 15 years—during the 1950's and 1960's—when we have liberalized benefits, we have not made them retroactive, and as a result we have a patchwork quilt in which a difference of a year or two in retirement dates can make a tremendous difference in the benefits available and their cost.

I am today introducing three bills which will wipe out some of these inequities and make adjustments in the system to equalize its benefits to all concerned.

The first, which I am introducing for myself and Senator MONTOYA, is an omnibus bill which deals with eight inequities relating to various phases of the retirement system including such aspects as the formula for voluntary deductions from civil service retirement annuities to provide for a surviving spouse, the provisions affecting the age at which widows of former employees may remarry and not lose their survivor annuities, the rights of deferred annuitants with respect to survivor annuities, the rights of employees to make contributions to the retirement fund after completing service sufficient to earn a maximum annuity, and to many other aspects which I will not take the time to spell out here.

But it is clear that these inequities should be cleared up if we are to keep faith with our retired Government employees. And it is equally clear that unless we make an effort to correlate the benefits awarded prospectively during the past 15 years and the benefits now paid to those who retired prior to the effective dates for such prospective legislation, we cannot give assurance to present Federal employees that they, too, will not be forgotten as soon as they leave the working force.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 436) to equalize civil service retirement annuities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Moss (for himself and Mr. MONTOYA), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the second bill I introduce deals with one glaring inequity which is providing a special hardship on a number of retirees. The present law provides that when a retiree is predeceased by the survivor he has named, the reduction he has taken in his retirement continues even though the retiree remarries, and it keeps him from providing a survivor annuity to his second spouse. This is obviously not fair. The retiree has reduced his own annuity to provide for his spouse—this spouse dies, and he remarries, and although he still must take a reduced annuity each month, he cannot provide any security for his second spouse. One can change a beneficiary on an insurance policy—why not on a survivor annuity, which is in itself a form of insurance a person may take out by taking deductions in the amount he receives each month?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 437) to amend chapter 83, title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the reduction in the annuities of employees or Members who elected reduced annuities in order to provide a survivor annuity if predeceased by the person named as survivor and permit a retired employee or Member to designate a new spouse as survivor if predeceased by the person named as survivor at the time of retirement, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the last bill I am introducing would make certain types of employees rendering service to States or instrumentalities of States in Federal-State programs, eligible for inclusion under the civil service retirement system. I have received many letters on this from all over the country—as I am sure my colleagues have also—it is a bill which has been under consideration for several sessions, and I hope it can be enacted in the 91st Congress. Its passage is long past due.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the three bills be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 438) to amend section 8332 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited services of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; and the three above-mentioned bills will be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 436

A bill to equalize civil service retirement annuities, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding any other provision of law each employee or Member as defined in section 8331 of title 5, United States Code, who retired prior to October 11, 1962, and who elected a reduced annuity in order to provide a survivor annuity for a spouse, shall be paid a reduced annuity computed in accordance with the provisions of section 8339(i) of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law each employee as defined in section 8331 of title 5, United States Code, who retired prior to July 18, 1966, and who had attained the age of fifty-five and completed thirty years of service at the time of separation from the service, shall be paid an annuity computed as provided in section 8339(a) of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law each employee as defined in section 8331 of title 5, United States Code, who was separated from the service prior to July 31, 1956, after completing five years of service and who is retired after attaining the age of sixty-two, may elect to receive a reduced annuity computed in accordance with the provisions of section 8339(i) of title 5, United States Code, and designate in writing a spouse to whom married prior to date of separation from service to receive a survivor annuity.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law the survivor annuity of each spouse of an employee or member, as defined in section 8331 of title 5, United States Code, who died or retired prior to July 18, 1966, terminated because of the remarriage of the surviving spouse, shall upon attainment of age sixty by such surviving spouse or upon dissolution of the remarriage of the surviving spouse by death, annulment or divorce be resumed pursuant to the provisions of section 8341 of title 5, United States Code at the same rate to which said surviving spouse would be entitled if there had been no remarriage: *Provided,* That (1) said surviving spouse elects to receive such annuity in lieu of any survivor benefit to which he or she may be entitled, under this or any other retirement system established for employees of the Government, by reason of the remarriage, and (2) any lump sum paid upon termination of the annuity is returned to the fund.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law the provisions of section 8342 (h) of title 5, United States Code, shall be applicable to all employees or members as defined in section 8331 of title 5, United States Code, who were retired prior to July 12, 1960.

SEC. 6. Notwithstanding any other provision of law section 8339(f) of title 5, United States Code, shall be applicable to each employee or member as defined in section 8331 of title 5, United States Code, who retired on account of disability prior to October 1, 1956.

SEC. 7. Section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide increases in certain annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 219, Public Law 85-465), is amended: By striking out the word "ten" in clause numbered (1) and substituting therefor the word "five"; by striking out the word "five" in line 11 and substituting therefor the word "two"; and by adding after the word "widower" in line 20 the words "but shall be resumed upon

even an electric train in the scale model of the Project Rover site.

"The museum began in 1963 in an old barracks-type building," said Robert Y. Porton, director of community relations. "We moved into the present new building in 1965."

Most popular exhibit, according to a recent public opinion poll, is "Pinocchio," an ingenious device for illustrating a nuclear chain reaction.

Pinocchio looks like a cross between a pinball machine and a large aquarium. Four glass walls encloes approximately one square yard of space over a "floor" with a grid of ping-pong ball sized holes.

When a chain reaction takes place in atoms of Uranium 235, a neutron striking the nucleus of a U–235 atom causes the atom to split in two, releasing two free neutrons. These two, all else being equal, strike two more nuclei, splitting them and releasing four neutrons, and so on.

In Pinocchio, a lone ping-pong ball represents the first free neutron. Each of the holes represents a U–235 nucleus.

The museum attendant drops the "neutron" in the glass box. It bounces around aimlessly, eventually dropping into one of the holes.

Out shoot two ping-pong balls, and these "neutrons" repeat the performance. Soon the glass box is filled with wildly bouncing "neutrons," and the "splitting atoms" sound like a cowboys-and-Indians shoot-em-up.

Community relations staff member Kent Bulloch told of the experience of an Italian film crew trying to film Pinocchio in action.

The ping-pong balls trigger the ejection of their fellows by tripping photoelectric cells, Bulloch explained. When the Italian crew turned on their floodlights and the first ball was dropped in, it fell into a hole and nothing happened.

Bulloch suggested turning off the floodlights temporarily, and "there was an explosion of ping-pong balls," as every tube fired, activated by the flood lights being turned off.

Pinocchio was so named because as his namesake wanted to be a real human, but couldn't, LASL's Pinocchio wants to be a real reactor, but can't.

In an average month, more than 5,000 persons sign in at the museum. The visitors have come from all 50 states and more than 70 foreign countries.

One day last week, for example, persons from six different states toured the facility.

The museum has its serious side, too.

In the patio are ballistic cases like the two which carried nuclear holocaust to Japan in World War II, and two sleeker, more modern looking casings, one from a 20 kiloton nuclear bomb and the other from a thermonuclear hydrogen bomb.

The more peaceful uses of the atom share the patio with the bombs, however. Kiwi-A, the first experimental nuclear rocket reactor is on display.

The museum, the only Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory area in which cameras are welcome, is open from 8 a.m. to noon and 1 to 5 p.m. Monday through Friday, and 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. Saturdays, and 1 p.m. to 5 p.m. Sundays.

One very simple display makes a very startling indication of the difference in densities of various elements. It is a table on which are placed three-inch cubes of various elements.

Each has a handle by which the observer can lift the identically sized cubes and compare their weights.

The weights vary from the magnesium cube, at 1.75 lbs., to the uranium cube, weighing 18.97 lbs.

The most exotic cube by far is one of solid gold, valued at more than $10,000. It is kept locked in a safe when not on display.

In Project Sherwood at LASL, scientists are trying to devise some method of containing a thermonuclear reaction and tap it for its power potential. The problem with the concept is that thermonuclear reactions take place at such temperatures that all known materials on earth would quickly vaporize.

Project Sherwood scientists are working on a Buck Rogers-styled electromagnetic "force field" to contain the reaction.

Even though one of the project scientists compared the method to "trying to contain Jello with rubber bands on a hot day," the physicists hope to solve the problem in a few years.

Scylla II, the portion of Sherwood concerned with the force field, is represented in the museum.

A tube of aluminum foil is inserted into a plastic tube around which two electromagnetic coils are wound. Electricity is fed to a capacitor which, when it discharges, momentarily creates a strong electromagnetic field in the coils.

The electromagnetic fields instantly crush both ends of the foil tube closed, causing a report as loud as a firecracker.

The museum, however, like the city of Los Alamos, is aware that the history of New Mexico didn't begin with the coming of the nuclear age.

The entrance hall of the museum contains cases of artifacts from the Pajarito Plateau's first tenants, Indians who were there back when gunpowder was the "ultimate weapon."

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, a national nuclear museum could take advantage of what Congress already has provided for the development of finer museums. I urge for action on this measure during this session of Congress. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 418) to authorize the establishment of a national nuclear museum, introduced by Mr. MONTOYA, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 418

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Atomic Energy Commission is authorized and directed to provide for the establishment and maintenance, at a suitable site in the State of New Mexico, of a National Nuclear Museum for the advancement of public knowledge with respect to matters pertaining to the uses and development of nuclear energy. The Commission is authorized to acquire the site for such museum by purchase, gift, condemnation, or otherwise, and to make all necessary improvements thereto. Items displayed in such museum shall be selected to reflect their historical interest and educational value, subject to such limitations as the Commission in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, determines are necessary to the interests of the national security.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

S. 419—INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION DEALING WITH WORKDAYS AND WORKWEEKS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, the Federal Government needs to take another look at its labor-management relations with civil service and wage board employees. It is inexcusable that in this day and age, some Federal agencies are clinging rigidly to practices bordering on the "sweat shop" conditions of a few decades ago.

There are two practices in particular which I find abominable—yet, judging from the number of complaints I have received, they are widely used by some agency executives.

One is the splitting of work-shift schedules without proper notice to employees—causing some to work extremely long hours on a few days of the week, or to work fewer hours but on more than 5 days—all to avoid the payment of overtime. Another, more reprehensible practice is that of scheduling employees to work back-to-back 5-day shifts over 2 workweeks—resulting in employees having to work 10 consecutive days without time off, and without overtime compensation.

In industry, our society no longer accepts such work schedules as being reasonable without the benefit of additional compensation. Yet, these practices are not only permitted by the present law—they are actually condoned by the heads of several agencies. I believe that we should now recognize that the Federal Government has the same responsibility to its employees as has been acknowledged by industry.

Therefore, I am introducing a bill to correct these practices by amending section 6101 of title 5 of the United States Code, relating to workweeks and workdays of Federal and District of Columbia employees. I am proposing that the head of any agency—in addition to recognizing the required basic workweek of 40 hours for each full-time employee—must establish a basic, nonovertime workday not to exceed 8 hours, and must schedule the hours of work within the basic workweek on 5 consecutive days.

Further, my bill would preclude requiring any employee to work more than 6 consecutive days without time off, and would require that employees or their appropriate recognized organizations be consulted on the equitable rotation of shift schedules in the case of night, weekend, or irregular tours of duty.

At the same time, adequate provision is made for alteration of work schedules to protect the public interest during a declared national emergency, or when it can be established that an agency would be seriously handicapped in carrying out its functions, or when costs would be substantially increased. Such alterations of schedule, however, would have to be justified by the head of an agency, with the concurrence of the Civil Service Commission Chairman.

I introduced a similar bill in the last session of Congress, and the response I

got was noteworthy. While Federal agencies strongly opposed the bill, every employee and employee organization responding hailed it as a step in the right direction. Several groups suggested constructive modifications, which I have attempted to incorporate in this new bill.

Mr. President, this is a complicated subject that requires serious thought in order to provide for flexibility in operating Federal installations, while at the same time protecting the rights of employees. Therefore, I urge that hearings be scheduled immediately to resolve any serious differences—as I believe that the time is long overdue for positive action to end the abuses. The Federal Government owes this to its employees.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of my bill printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 419) to amend section 6101 of title 5, United States Code, relating to workweeks and workdays of Federal and District of Columbia employees, introduced by Mr. MONTOYA, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 419

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 6101(a) of title 5, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"(2) The head of each executive agency, military department, and of the government of the District of Columbia shall—

"(A) establish a basic administrative workweek of forty hours for each full-time employee in his organization;

"(B) require that the basic nonovertime hours of work within that workweek be performed on five consecutive days; and

"(C) establish a basic nonovertime workday not to exceed eight hours.

"(3) Except during a declared national emergency, or when the head of an executive agency, a military department, or of the government of the District of Columbia determines, with the concurrence of the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, that his organization would be seriously handicapped in carrying out its functions or that costs would be substantially increased, he shall provide, with respect to each employee in his organization, that—

"(A) assignments to tours of duty are scheduled in advance over periods of not less than one week;

"(B) the basic forty-hour workweek is scheduled Monday through Friday when possible;

"(C) the working hours in each day in the basic workweek are of the same duration;

"(D) the two days outside the basic workweek are consecutive;

"(E) no more than six consecutive workdays may be scheduled within any two consecutive weeks;

"(F) the occurrence of holidays may not affect the designation of the basic workweek;

"(G) breaks in working hours of more than one hour may not be scheduled in a basic workday; and

"(H) in the case of night, weekend, and irregular tours of duty, equitable rotation of shift schedules will be established following consultation with employees or their appropriate recognized employee organization."

S. 421, S. 422, AND S. 423—INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO CORRECT INEQUITIES AFFECTING RETIRED CIVIL EMPLOYEES

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I introduce three bills which have the support of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees. The membership of this organization exceeds 135,000, and there are over 1,100 local chapters chartered throughout the United States. The organization serves civil service annuitants and their survivors, and potential annuitants and their survivors. The association has also actively been involved in the problems of the aged and the aging.

Mr. President, I believe that it would be an abdication of our responsibility to those who have served our Government so effectively were we to ignore the National Association of Retired Civil Employees and more than 800,000 Federal retirees and their survivors. I am convinced that the three measures I have introduced are worthy of our careful consideration and study.

I need not remind my colleagues that the rising cost of living has steadily reduced the buying power of those living on fixed incomes. When we consider this factor, along with the realization that most retired civil employees receive monthly annuities in an amount insufficient to maintain an acceptable standard of living, the inequity our retired civil employees face becomes evident. I suggest that we have a responsibility to correct this injustice, an obligation to permit a life of dignity on the part of those who have served us so well.

According to the 1967 report of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, Bureau of Retirement and Insurance, of an approximate 800,000 retired civil employees and their survivors, some 279,000 receive a monthly annuity of less than $100, and 513,000 receive less than $200 per month. To correct this inequity, we must grant these former Federal employees a substantial annuity increase and provide a minimum annuity for them. S. 421 would provide a graduated annuity increase, with the largest increase going to those presently receiving the smallest annuities. These increases would be as follows:

First. Retirees presently receiving an annuity of less than $200 per month would receive an increase of $26 per month.

Second. Retirees presently receiving an annuity of at least $200 but less than $300 per month would receive an increase of 13 percent.

Third. Retirees presently receiving an annuity of at least $300 but less than $400 per month would receive an increase of 9 percent.

Fourth. Retirees presently receiving an annuity of at least $400 but less than $500 per month would receive an increase of 7 percent.

Fifth. Retirees presently receiving an annuity of at least $500 per month would receive an increase of 5 percent.

S. 422 would exclude from the computation of gross income for Federal income tax purposes the first $5,000 received as civil service retirement annuity. Civil service retirees would thus be categorized as are the recipients of social security and railroad retirement annuities for purposes of Federal income tax. It is manifestly unfair to exempt retirement income received as social security and railroad retirement annuities from Federal income tax, while imposing the tax on the annuities of retired Federal workers and retired teachers and municipal workers of the District of Columbia.

S. 423 would establish a minimum of $100 per month for an annuitant with neither spouse nor dependents, and a minimum of $200 per month for an annuitant with a spouse or dependents.

Mr. President, I am convinced that these three bills deserve our immediate attention and favorable consideration, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bills be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. MONTOYA, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the appropriate committees, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 421. A bill to provide increased annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the annuity of each person who, on the effective date of this Act, is receiving or entitled to receive an annuity from the civil service retirement and disability fund shall be increased by—

$26.00 per month if now less than $200 per month,

13 per centum if now at least $200 but less than $300 per month,

9 per centum if now at least $300 but less than $400 per month,

7 per centum if now at least $400 but less than $500 per month, or

5 per centum if now at least $500 per month.

SEC. 2. The annuity of a survivor of a retired employee or Member who received an increase under this Act shall be increased in accordance with the formula set forth in section 1.

SEC. 3. No increase provided in this Act shall be computed on any additional annuity purchased at retirement by voluntary contributions.

SEC. 4. The increases provided by this Act shall become effective on the first day of the second month which begins after the date of enactment of this Act, except that any increase under section 2 shall take effect on the beginning date of the annuity.

SEC. 5. The monthly installment of annuity after adjustment under this Act shall be fixed at the nearest dollar.

SEC. 6. The provisions of section 8348(g) of title V, United States Code, shall not apply with respect to benefits resulting from the enactment of this Act.

S. 422. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first $5,000 received as civil service retirement annuity from the United States or any agency thereof shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Finance:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That part III of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to

the termination of such remarriage by death, annulment or divorce".

SEC. 8. An allowance of not to exceed five hundred dollars to cover expense of last illness and burial shall, upon application to the Civil Service Commission, be paid to the person or persons who bear such expenses of each employee as defined in section 8331 of title 5, United States Code, who retired to an immediate annuity or who retired because of disability, prior to August 17, 1954, and who was not entitled to Federal group life insurance pursuant to the provisions of chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 9. This Act shall take effect on the first day of the third month following its enactment: *Provided,* That no resulting annuity or increase in annuity shall be payable before the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 10. The provisions of section 8348(g) of title 5, United States Code shall not apply with respect to benefits resulting from the enactment of this Act.

S. 437

A bill to amend chapter 83, title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the reduction in the annuities of employees or Members who elected reduced annuities in order to provide a survivor annuity if predeceased by the person named as survivor and permit a retired employee or Member to designate a new spouse as survivor if predeceased by the person named as survivor at the time of retirement

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8339(i) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "If the designated spouse predeceases the employee or Member making such election the reduction shall be restored to the employee or Member and the annuity of such employee or Member shall be computed without regard to any election made under this subsection, provided that any such employee or Member may elect to designate a new spouse as survivor when such new spouse has attained the age of sixty and all reductions by reason of prior designations that have been restored to such employee or Member have been repaid to the retirement fund."

SEC. 2. Annuities of those employees or Members as defined in section 8331 of title 5, United States Code, predeceased by a designated spouse after the date of enactment of this Act shall be computed pursuant to the amendment contained in section 1 of this Act and be effective the first day of the month which begins after the date of death of the spouse designated at time of retirement or the first day of the mouth which begins after a new spouse attains the age of sixty. Annuities of those employees or Members as defined in section 8331 of title 5, United States Code, retired prior to the date of enactment of this Act and predeceased by a designated spouse shall be computed pursuant to the amendment contained in section 1 of this Act and be effective the first day of the third month following the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. The provisions of section 8348(g), title 5, United States Code, shall not apply with respect to benefits resulting from the enactment of this Act.

S. 438

A bill to amend section 8332 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited services of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8332 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1) Subject to the conditions contained in this subsection, any employee or Member who is serving in a position within the purview of section 8331 of title 5, United States Code, at the time of his retirement or death shall be allowed credit for all periods of service, not otherwise creditable, performed by him in connection with inspection and grading work pursuant to the authority contained in the annual Department of Agriculture Appropriations Act under the item 'Market inspection of farm products,' under agreements to which the Federal Government was a party, or performed by him (except for those periods in which the record shows he was certified as being eligible for relief) in the employ of a State, or a political subdivision thereof or of any instrumentality of either in the carrying out of—

"(1) the program of a State rural rehabilitation corporation created for the purpose of handling rural relief the funds for which were made available by the Federal Emergency Relief Act of 1933 (48 Stat. 55), the Act of February 15, 1934 (48 Stat. 351), and the Emergency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935 (48 Stat. 1055), and any laws or parts of law amendatory of, or supplementary to, such Acts;

"(2) the Federal-State cooperative program of agricultural experiment stations research and investigation authorized by the Act of March 2, 1887, as amended and supplemented (7 U.S.C., ch. 14);

"(3) the Federal-State cooperative program of vocational education authorized by the Act of February 23, 1917, as amended and supplemented (20 U.S.C., ch. 2);

"(4) the Federal-State cooperative program of agricultural extension work authorized by the Act of May 8, 1914, as amended and supplemented (7 U.S.C. 341–348);

"(5) the Clark-McNary Act (Act of June 7, 1924, as amended (16 U.S.C. 564–570)); the cooperative forest management program (Act of August 25, 1950, as amended (16 U.S.C. 568 c, d)); and operations under the Forest Pest Control Act (Act of June 25, 1947 (16 U.S.C. 594–1 through 594–5)) and their predecessor programs;

"(6) the Federal-State cooperative program for the control of plant pests and animal diseases authorized by the provisions of law set forth in chapters 7 and 8 of title 7 and in section 114a of title 21 of the United States Code;

"(7) the Federal-State cooperative program of the public employment service authorized under the Deficiency Appropriation Act of October 6, 1917, and as amended (29 U.S.C. 49); and annual appropriation Acts of the United States Department of Labor in subsequent years; the Wagner-Peyser Act of June 6, 1933 (U.S. Stat. 113), as amended (29 U.S.C. 49); and the provisions for employment service and unemployment insurance under title III of the Social Security Act of August 14, 1935, as amended (42 U.S.C. 501 et seq.):

"(8) the Federal-State cooperative program of highway construction authorized by the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented (23 U.S.C.);

"(9) the Federal-State cooperative assistance programs approved under titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act of August 14, 1935, as amended and supplemented (42 U.S.C., ch. 7, subchs. 1, 4, 5, 10, and 14), and under agreements entered into under section 221 of the Social Security Act of August 14, 1935, as amended and supplemented (42 U.S.C. ch. 7, sec. 421);

"(10) the Federal-State cooperative program of vocational rehabilitation authorized by the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of August 3, 1954, as amended and supplemented (29 U.S.C., ch. 4, secs. 31–42);

"(11) the cooperative program of fish restoration and management authorized by the Fish Restoration and Management Act of August 9, 1950, as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 777 A–K);

"(12) the cooperative program in wildlife restoration authorized by the Wildlife Restoration Act of September 2, 1937, as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 669–669j);

"(13) the Federal-State cooperative program in marketing service and research authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1621 et seq.), and predecessor programs;

"(14) the public health programs authorized by sections 309, 314, and 316 of the Public Health Service Act (Public Law 410) of July 1, 1944, as amended and supplemented (42 U.S.C. 242g, 246, 247a);

"(15) the program of aid to certain public schools for the education of Indian children authorized by the Johnson-O'Malley Act of April 16, 1934, as amended by the Act of June 4, 1936, as amended and supplemented (48 Stat. 596).

The period of any service specified in this subsection shall be included in computing length of service for the purposes of this section of any officer or employee only upon compliance with the following conditions:

"(A) The employee or Members shall have to his credit a total period of not less than five years of allowable service under this section, exclusive of service allowed by this subsection;

"(B) The performance of such service is certified, in a form prescribed by the Civil Service Commission, by the head, or by a person designated by the head, of the department, agency, or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government of the United States which administers the provisions of law authorizing the performance of such service, or is otherwise established to the satisfaction of the Commission;

"(C) The employee or Member shall have deposited with interest at 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, to the credit of the civil service retirement and disability fund a sum equal to the aggregate of the amounts that would have been deducted from his basic salary, pay, or compensation during the period of service credited under this subsection if during such period he had been subject to this section, except that this paragraph shall not apply to services covered in paragraph (D) below;

"(D) The annuity computed under this subsection is reduced by the amount of any State annuity (including social security benefits) which an employee is receiving, or may receive, toward which the employee contributed during such State service and to which he is entitled by reason of such State service. As used in this subsection, the term 'State' includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any political subdivision thereof, or of any instrumentality of either."

SEC. 2. The annuity of any person who shall have performed service described in subsection (1) of section 8332 of title 5, United States Code, as amended, and who on or after June 30, 1942, and before the date of enactment of this Act shall have been retired on annuity then or now payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, shall, upon application filed by such person within one year after the date of enactment of this Act and upon compliance with the conditions prescribed by such subsection (1) be adjusted, effective as of the first day of the month immediately following the date of enactment of this Act, so that the amount of such annuity will be the same as if such subsection (1) had been in effect at the time of such person's retirement.

SEC. 3. The provisions of section 8348(g) of title 5, United States Code, shall not apply with respect to benefits resulting from the enactment of this Act.

S. 472—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO LIBERALIZE THE EARNINGS TEST UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, when the Senate considered the 1967 Social Security Act, I offered an amendment to increase the earnings limitation from the proposed $1,680 to $2,400 annually. The amendment was adopted by a vote of 50 to 23, indicating that the Senate was strongly in favor of modernizing the arbitrary and restrictive test on earnings by the elderly. In the face of this one-sided Senate vote, and contrary to widespread sentiment among House Members in favor of the change, the conference committee was ill advised in deleting the amendment.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am today introducing the amendment in bill form and in the hope that the Senate Finance Committee, under the able leadership of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG) will act quickly and favorable on this proposal—and not delay its consideration pending the new administration's recommendations on a social security package.

Briefly, this bill would permit a social security recipient to earn $2,400 annually before suffering any reduction in benefits. For every $2 earned between $2,400 and $3,600, the beneficiary would lose $1 in benefits. Beyond that, $1 in earnings would result in the loss of $1 in benefits.

Mr. President, as a result of the 13-percent increase in cash benefits voted by the Congress in 1967, the average monthly benefit paid to an elderly couple is approximately $165. Thus, a social security beneficiary who continued to hold employment, and who was paid the average monthly benefit, could receive a combined income for he and his wife of $5,000 annually before continued employment resulted in an equal reduction in benefits. In view of the greatly increased cost of living and the fact that a very large percentage of the elderly's income—about two-thirds—is spent on food, shelter, clothing, and medical care, I believe that the $5,000 figure is a modest one.

As a society, we are today committed to the simple and just proposition that old age should not mean added life without dignity, but added dignity with life. How can we insure that dignity, that feeling of self-respect? The answer is to see that our senior citizens are self-sufficient; that they are not dependent upon welfare payments; that they are not subject to the embarrassments that come from dependence upon their children. And the way to do that, Mr. President, is to provide them with the opportunity for continued employment to supplement social security.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 472) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title, introduced by Mr. BAYH (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

LISTING OF COSPONSORS OF S. 14

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, yesterday, in requesting that the cosponsors of S. 14 be included at the next printing of the bill, the list of names was incorrectly shown in the RECORD. Therefore, I make the following request.

I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 14, my bill to establish a Commission on Afro-American History and Culture, that the list of cosponsors be included. The names of the cosponsors were inadvertently omitted from the draft of the bill. However, I announced the cosponsors at the beginning of my remarks when I introduced S. 14. My statement can be found on page S258 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 15, 1969. The following Senators are cosponsors of S. 14: Senators BAYH, BROOKE, CASE, COOK, GOODELL, HART, HARTKE, HATFIELD, INOUYE, JAVITS, MCGEE, MATHIAS, MILLER, MONDALE, MUSKIE, NELSON, PERCY, SCHWEIKER, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1) to provide for uniform and equitable treatment of persons displaced from their homes, businesses, or farms by Federal and federally assisted programs and to establish uniform and equitable land acquisition policies for Federal and federally assisted programs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I am delighted to announce that Senator HOWARD BAKER has requested that his name be added to the list of Senators cosponsoring Senate Joint Resolution 1, a proposed amendment to the Constitution calling for a direct election of the President and Vice President of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that Senator BAKER's name appear on Senate Joint Resolution 1 as a cosponsor at its next printing.

In addition, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point the text of remarks recently made by Senator BAKER on this subject. I believe that they shall be of interest to other Senators and to those persons who are following efforts to reform the present electoral system.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY SENATOR HOWARD H. BAKER, JR., PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BEFORE THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE INVESTMENT BANKERS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, IN MIAMI BEACH, FLA., DECEMBER 5, 1968

MIAMI BEACH.—There has always been a good deal of distance and distrust between the American citizen and "them", "them" being my colleagues and I, the elected and appointed officials of the Government. "Theys" and "thems" get the blame whenever Government does something to you that you don't like. "Theys" and "Themis" are the sufficiently amorphous personalities who make it possible for the officeholders, if we are so inclined, to hide in any number of bureaucratic mazes and avoid being tagged with much of the blame for what "they" did.

But the times are changing. There is quite obviously a growing number of Americans who feel unable to communicate effectively with their government. There is an increasing feeling that the individual is not really relevant enough to the governmental process. And when this really sinks in, my guess is that the average American citizen won't stand for it. More and more in this age of instant communication and superior education, people are insisting that they have a real role in what their government does for them or to them.

The major political figures of 1968 all sensed this simmering among the members of the electorate. Everyone from Governor Wallace to Senator McCarthy called for "more power back to the people." And most candidates this year made a point to do some listening as well as talking.

President-elect Nixon's appeal for a wide variety of views within his Administration reflected this: "We should invite constructive criticism, not only because the critics have a right to be heard but because they often have something worth hearing."

The success of the Nixon Administration will be judged, to a significant extent, upon whether it is able to establish in America better communication between the government and the electorate. And I am convinced that, in order to achieve this reconciliation, some radical changes are going to be necessary.

One such step is the refederalization of our governments, the reversing of the centralizing trends which have dominated our federal structure for 35 years. More of our money should be spent and more of our decisions made at a level of government closer to the people, at a more accessible level where those citizens affected by governmental decisions can get their hands on the elected or appointed officials making the decisions. Refederalization will require as a first step the initiation of a system of Federal Revenue Sharing or Federal Tax Refunds to the states. This is a big, bold, essential and difficult step about which I could say a lot.

But instead, today I wish to discuss the electoral process, where, in my opinion, sweeping fundamental reforms must be accomplished in order to take the first steps in making the government adequately responsive to the electorate it serves in these modern times.

Throughout history there have always been qualifications to the central notion that each citizen in the nation should have a vote to determine who the representatives in government shall be, and that each man's vote, as much as is practicable, should count as much as the next man's. These qualifications, which have had more or less validity depending upon the times and circumstances (although some never had any validity at all), have included age, length of residency, race, property ownership, and accident of geographical location.

The trend of the last few years has been to strip away conditions to full participation in the electoral process except when there are clearly overwhelming considerations. For example, strong and effective efforts in the courts and Congress have virtually obliterated the totally invalid consideration of race as a restriction on an individual's right to vote. A few states already have reduced the voting age below 21 in recognition of the fact that the modern 18, 19 or 20-year old is suitably intelligent, aware and interested in public affairs to vote and that there is no overwhelming reason to deny him that right.

Sweeping strides have been taken in the courts and in Congress during the 1960's to

CITATION FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE: JOHN O. CROW

In recognition of an eminent career with the Department of the Interior.

Mr. Crow is an outstanding Public Land Administrator who has received recognition throughout the Department for his service to the Nation at the highest levels of administrative responsibility. He became Associate Director of the Bureau of Land Management in November 1965. Mr. Crow possesses extraordinary executive ability and demonstrated diversified administrative and management expertise in the Bureau's management and conservation of the public domain and its natural resources. Associate Director Crow recently served on a special committee which drew up the constitution and selected the first board of trustees for a proposed American Indian Athletic Hall of Fame at Haskell Institute in Lawrence, Kansas. The Hall will memorialize the achievements of great Indian athletes and will inspire young Indians to develop rewarding and productive lives. Mr. Crow served with distinction in various roles with the Bureau of Indian Affairs and was Superintendent of the Mescalero, Fort Apache, and Uintah and Ouray Agencies. He was an aggressive leader in the field of program administration. As Realty Program Administrator, he was outstanding in his direction of all activities involving approximately 55 million acres of Indian trust and Government-owned land. Mr. Crow was serving in this capacity when President Kennedy appointed him as Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs. A Cherokee Indian, he was the first person of American descent to assume responsibility as Commissioner since 1871. As a tribute to his superior service, Mr. Crow is granted the highest honor of the Department of the Interior, its Distinguished Service Award.

STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

THE LATE DR. COURTNEY C. SMITH

(Mr. MAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, it is with the deepest sadness that I report to the House the passing yesterday of a great American, Dr. Courtney C. Smith, president of Swarthmore College, at the age of 52. Dr. Smith was stricken in his office above the college admissions office which was still occupied after more than a week by members of the Swarthmore Afro-American Society.

He has been under great strain during the occupation and suffered a heart attack while waiting to meet with a faculty committee to consider the demonstrators demands on admissions and policymaking.

Courtney Smith was a steadfast champion of academic freedom and of civil rights throughout his life. As American Secretary of the Rhode Scholarships since 1953, he worked effectively to insure fair treatment for minority groups in the Rhodes selection process. He had pioneered in efforts to recruit Negroes for the Swarthmore student body. This did not divert him from the American goal of achieving the highest possible educational standards, and he was determined that neither students nor faculty should be reduced to the lowest common denominator.

When Dr. Smith became president of Swarthmore in 1953 at the age of 36, he was one of the youngest college presidents in the country. In the ensuing years an already first-rate college has become great under his inspired leadership. Proud as he was of a most successful building program, his greatest accomplishment has been a truly remarkable strengthening of faculty and student body.

In the crisis of confrontation at his beloved Swarthmore during the past 8 days he refused to compromise his faith in the education process in order to appease those who resorted to force and disruptiveness. In the end, this cost him his life.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my great honor to claim Courtney Smith as a friend since we entered college together as freshmen in the fall of 1934. All true friends of education will mourn his passing. I offer my deepest sympathy to his beloved Betty, his son, and two daughters who survive.

LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH BANK TO PROVIDE FEDERAL SOURCES FOR RURAL TELEPHONE SYSTEMS

(Mr. KLEPPE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation establishing a bank to provide new supplemental financing from both private and Federal sources for rural telephone systems.

An identical measure was approved by a 23-to-5 vote of the House Agriculture Committee, of which I am a member, during the last session of Congress. The House Rules Committee, however, voted to defer action on the bill.

This legislation, which I supported, is designed primarily to bring funds from the private money market into the rural telephone program. It authorizes sales of RTA debentures up to an amount not exceeding eight times the capital subscribed by the Government itself.

The Government would furnish capital to the telephone bank at a rate of $30 million annually, not out of U.S. Treasury funds but from repayments of outstanding rural telephone loans, until the total reached $300 million. The bank would pay 2 percent interest on money provided by the Government.

Bank loans would be made to both cooperatives and privately owned telephone systems which previously received REA 2-percent loans, at a rate reflecting cost of money. This would be a blend of the cost of Government-advanced capital and the funds derived from the sale of debentures in the private money market.

The legislation does not change present authority to make direct 2-percent loans to qualified borrowers operating in areas with a low density of telephones.

TRIBUTE TO HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

(Mr. DE LA GARZA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed emotions that I join in the just and wholesome praise we heap today on our fine President and my fellow Texan, Lyndon B. Johnson. Mixed because for me, personally, an era is passing. I cannot imagine Texas not having Lyndon Johnson in Washington. He has been here for most of my life. When I was a young fellow in 1948, I nailed his campaign posters to the telephone poles and from his first visit to my area after being elected Senator, until his last day as President, he was always available to me personally for all the problems of my district, first, when I was in the Texas Legislature and more so since I came to Congress.

I hate to seem him leave the Nation's Capital. But I know the Nation will always profit from his advice, his counsel, and the legacy of accomplishment he leaves behind. His state of the Union message was the report of a man who had given his all to the country—and I know of no Member of this House who was not moved by the nostalgia with which he spoke of his service here.

For my part of the country I say to the President with deep fondness, not adios, but hasta la vista—Vaya con Dios, Señor Presidente.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that the President is sending some messages to the House which will be here shortly. Without objection, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) at 12 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN RUSK CLOSES OUT 8 BRILLIANT YEARS IN OFFICE

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time this morning just to comment on the fact that on Monday next a great American who has occupied with great distinction a position of great responsibility in this country for a period of 8 years, longer than all but one of his predecessors, will be stepping down from office. Of course, I am referring to Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

Mr. Rusk has been under attack from time to time in recent years by those who have opposed our policy in Vietnam. I do not think, though, that the people who have attacked him because of their

feeling on the policy our country has followed really recognize Mr. Rusk's unique and tremendous abilities. The President referred to him the other day as "the greatest," and I would certainly subscribe completely to that appellation.

I have known Mr. Rusk for a long time. I knew him when he came to the Department of State in 1947 as an assistant to General Marshall whom he had also served brilliantly as a colonel in the Pentagon. I can remember in the days when I was associated with the Far Eastern Commission seeing this young former colonel coming in to a meeting of diplomatic officials and in a few minutes, in a very quiet and dispassionate way, summing up all of the complex issues very clearly and simply, and indicating what the course of action or the alternatives should be. It takes a superior intelligence to make complex problems clear and simple. As Secretary, Mr. Rusk has often employed that same clear, quiet, unflappable ability to summarize, to explain—before the television cameras, before Senate committes, and in regular Wednesday morning briefings to Members of the House.

In fact, last fall in his final appearance to brief House Members before the 90th Congress adjourned, Republican and Democratic Members gave the Secretary a warm standing ovation in tribute to his patience and his clarity on these complex issues of war and peace with which he has had to wrestle for 8 years.

Besides his exceptional intellectual qualities, one other aspect of Dean Rusk has stood out consistently, his strength and his steadfastness. With all the unfair attacks, all of the needling, he has never lost his cool. In spite of all the pressure from different sides, and all the winds of political change, he has never switched his position for the sake of expediency. That was because his position was not just a pragmatic policy of the passing moment, but was based on a deep philosophical conviction of what was right and what was wrong for this country and for the future of our world.

I realize that it is hard for people who did not live through those turbulent years before World War II when our efforts to maintain peace and prevent all-out war went for nought; but those of us who did live through them know that no task is more vital today than finding the means for preventing a recurrence of the drift toward world war that took place before 1941.

This has been Dean Rusk's primary and overriding objective as Secretary; and I agree wtih him that one of our greatest achievements during his 8 years in office has been our continued success in preventing world war III. We are all indebted to him for his devotion and his steadfastness under the leadership of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

In his steadfastness, in his calm fortitude, in his repeated refusal to be swayed or altered by the shifting winds of political expedience, Dean Rusk reminds us of another great world statesman of this century, Sir Winston Churchill, who was sneered at in the popular press and relegated to the back benches of his party in Parliament, all because he had never tempered his opposition to the appeasement of Adolf Hitler in the days before 1939.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt about what the ultimate judgment of history will be on the career of Secretary Rusk. The other day the press quoted the senior Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS)—who has in recent years been a persistent critic of our Vietnam policy—as acknowledging very candidly:

> Who knows, history may decide that those of us who opposed the war were wrong and those who supported it were right.

That is precisely what I am convinced history will show, and when that story is written large on the annals of history I know Dean Rusk's name will be in the foremost rank.

We are all proud that Dean Rusk has been our Secretary of State in this turbulent period. We wish him and his very able wife good luck and Godspeed in the years ahead. A man who started out as a schoolteacher in a small if distinguished women's college in the Far West, and then later a top staff officer in the U.S. Army, Dean Rusk, in discharging a top leadership position in the Nation with great distinction, has indeed become in his lifetime the embodiment of the intellectual in politics, the fulfillment of the ancient ideal of the philosopher-king, of whom Plato wrote so eloquently that:

> Until philosophers are kings, or the kings and princes of this world have the spirit and power of philosophy, and those commoner natures who pursue either to the exclusion of the other are compelled to stand aside, cities will never have rest from their evils, no, nor the human race, as I believe; and then only will this, our State, have a possibility of life and behold the light of day.

SALARY INCREASE FOR CONGRESSMEN AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday I introduced House Resolution 133 disapproving the proposed salary increase for Members of Congress as well as the executive and judicial branches of the Government. It is an unconscionable and outrageous pay increase. Today I introduced another resolution, which I trust will go to the Committee on Rules. I have introduced that resolution because I fear the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee will not give consideration to House Resolution 133, which calls for rejection of these outlandish pay increases. I suggest that any Members who are interested also introduce one or both of those resolutions.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Does the gentleman from Iowa take the position that the Members knew what the salary of a Member of Congress was when they ran for office last fall, and, therefore, should at least postpone this until a new Congress is elected?

Mr. GROSS. That is exactly right. Certainly they knew, and I thank the gentleman from Florida for his observation.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Chair lays before the House a message from the President of the United States.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present, in view of the Presidential messages.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 12]

Abbitt	Fish	O'Neill, Mass.
Abernethy	Ford,	Ottinger
Adair	William D.	Patten
Addabbo	Fraser	Pepper
Andrews, Ala.	Frelinghuysen	Philbin
Annunzio	Friedel	Pike
Arends	Fulton, Pa.	Pirnie
Ayres	Fulton, Tenn.	Podell
Baring	Fuqua	Poff
Barrett	Galifianakis	Powell
Battin	Gallagher	Price, Ill.
Bell, Calif.	Garmatz	Pryor
Biaggi	Gaydos	Pucinski
Biester	Giaimo	Purcell
Bingham	Gilbert	Quie
Blackburn	Green, Pa.	Quillen
Blatnik	Grover	Rees
Boggs	Hagan	Reid, Ill.
Bolling	Halpern	Reifel
Brademas	Hanna	Reuss
Brasco	Hansen, Idaho	Rivers
Brown, Calif.	Hansen, Wash.	Robison
Brown, Mich.	Hastings	Ronan
Burleson, Tex.	Hays	Rooney, Pa.
Byrne, Pa.	Hébert	Rosenthal
Cahill	Heckler, Mass.	Rostenkowski
Camp	Helstoski	Roth
Carey	Hogan	Roybal
Casey	Hollfield	St Germain
Celler	Hull	St. Onge
Chappell	Ichord	Sandman
Chisholm	Jacobs	Satterfield
Clancy	Jarman	Scherle
Clark	Joelson	Scheuer
Clausen,	Jonas	Sebelius
Don H.	Jones, N.C.	Shipley
Clay	Kee	Skubitz
Collier	Kirwan	Smith, Calif.
Conte	Koch	Smith, Iowa
Conyers	Kyros	Springer
Cramer	Laird	Staggers
Cunningham	Landrum	Steiger, Wis.
Daddario	Langen	Stephens
Daniels, N.J.	Long, La.	Stuckey
Davis, Ga.	Long, Md.	Symington
Dawson	Lowenstein	Taft
Delaney	Lukens	Teague, Calif.
Dent	McClory	Teague, Tex.
Diggs	McCloskey	Thompson, Ga.
Dingell	McClure	Thompson, N.J.
Donohue	McDade	Ullman
Dorn	McKneally	Utt
Downing	McMillan	Vigorito
Dwyer	Macdonald,	Watkins
Edmondson	Mass.	Watson
Edwards, Calif.	Mailliard	Watts
Edwards, La.	Martin	Whalley
Ellberg	Mathias	Wilson, Bob
Erlenborn	Miller, Calif.	Wold
Esch	Minish	Wolff
Eshleman	Mize	Wright
Everett	Monagan	Wydler
Evins, Tenn.	Morgan	Yates
Fallon	Morton	Young
Farbstein	Murphy, N.Y.	
Fascell	Nix	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 241 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

W. Marvin Watson, a great Postmaster General, certainly.

And now, W. Marvin Watson, the greatest exponent of postal training and education, certainly.

His impact on the postal service has been major. It will last for generations. And all Americans will benefit.

TRIBUTE TO MILTON R. YOUNG OF NORTH DAKOTA

(Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues what I feel is a splendid and well-deserved tribute to one of the most hard-working and effective Senators this Nation has ever had—MILTON R. YOUNG, of North Dakota.

Andrew Freeman, manager of Minnkota Power Cooperative, Inc., Grand Forks, N. Dak., in a letter to his board of directors, outlines the reasons for naming their new generating plant after the honored senior Senator from North Dakota. In it, he points out the great contribution MILT YOUNG has made to agriculture, our State, and our Nation.

An indication of the esteem with which MILTON YOUNG is held in North Dakota is found in the fact that he has lost only a total of three counties in nine statewide elections, carrying 474 out of a possible 477 counties in the nine campaigns. That is a truly remarkable record.

In the letter I wish to insert at this time, Mr. Freeman outlines some of the reasons why we are proud of MILT YOUNG in North Dakota and reasons why all America can be proud to have such a dedicated servant of the people in the U.S. Senate. The letter follows:

MINNKOTA POWER COOPERATIVES, INC.,
Grand Forks, N. Dak., January 7, 1969.

The HONORABLE MARK ANDREWS,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDREWS: I would like to recommend that the board give consideration to naming our new Center plant the Milton R. Young Station in honor of our Senior Senator from North Dakota.

There are a good many reasons why I think so and among them would be the following:

1. He is an honorable man.
2. He is a farmer.
3. He was a North Dakota State Senator prior to becoming a United States Senator. As such he worked for the adoption of the REA Act in North Dakota and the 2% Gross Income Tax Law, which has saved the rural electric cooperatives of North Dakota millions of dollars.
4. He has served in the United States Senate continuously since 1945.
5. He has recently been reelected to a new 6 year term by an overwhelming majority.
6. He is a very highly regarded man. Many Democrats and Republicans think well of him. He is highly regarded by people in the labor movement, the Farmer's Union, the Farm Bureau, as well as by people in educational and other professional circles.
7. He is the Senior Republican and a Ranking Member of the powerful Appropriations Committee of the United States Senate.
8. He is a very influential member of the party that will be in power the next four years. President-elect Nixon has publicly stated that he will rely heavily upon the advice of Milt Young.
9. He serves as a member of the Senate Committee which deals with highly secretive work of the C.I.A. This indicates the great confidence and high regard in which he is held by his colleagues.
10. He is the leading spokesman for agriculture in the Congress of the United States and few are considered to be his equal when it comes to knowledge of farm problems.
11. His record in behalf of REA is outstanding. NRECA rates him as having voted favorably on 70% of the subjects they favored.
12. During his period in office, REA has appropriated money for 4 large plants including our own Center unit.
13. He has effectively worked in behalf of Garrison Dam, along with his other colleagues from North Dakota.
14. He has helped and worked with numerous rural electric cooperatives in North Dakota to secure for them many of the missile, radar and air base electric loads in North Dakota, which they now serve.
15. He has recently been instrumental in getting Lockheed to announce a North Dakota Assembly plant.
16. For the last three years, he and a fellow Senator have been successful in getting REA appropriations substantially increased. He has done this same thing several times previously over the years when funds were short
17. He has worked in cooperation with other Senators to free funds when the Bureau of the Budget sought to tie them up.
18. He was singularly instrumental in getting restrictive language removed from a Senate memo intended to regulate REA appropriations. This came at a very critical time and it proved to be a key factor that led to the approval of our loan.
19. He has worked for the construction of key Bureau lines, as well as elimination of some of them whenever it was shown they were to have a detrimental effect on the rural electric coops.
20. His interest in the farmer and the farmers problem is unmatched by anyone. His interest in the REA program has been a continuous one.

The rural electric cooperatives of this nation and Minnkota in particular, are indebted to a great many men for help which they have been given. These include other Senators and Representatives, Directors, Managers, key personnel and employees of the Rural Electrification Administration. However, none can match the many and great contributions of Senator Milton R. Young.

At the present time our rural electric program is in serious trouble. It is on the threshold of undergoing serious changes. It is facing a new Administration in which Senator Young is a key figure. Senator Young, with or without our recognition, will continue to work for and protect the interest of the rural electric cooperatives. However, if we are to ever recognize and honor a man for his work, I can think of no one more appropriate, no one more deserving, than Senator Young, and no time more appropriate than today to do it.

If you could see your way clear to do this, I would consider it a very great personal favor and as an action which grants honor and recognition to a man to whom honor and respect are due.

Yours very sincerely,
Bill
ANDREW L. FREEMAN,
Manager.

PROPOSED INCREASED SALARIES FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I hope all Members were here when I posed my parliamentary inquiry a while ago. I simply wanted to know on what basis the proposal of the Commission for the increased salaries—as created by this Congress—against my vote—was submitted with the budget, as stated as "a must" in today's Presidential message.

Members present heard the ruling of the Chair. They heard the answer to my parliamentary inquiry. I am not appealing that answer. But, I am very upset by the information provided.

Indeed, I feel some great and circuitous stratagem is being employed or some hanky-panky is being used, because since I posed that parliamentary inquiry and received my answer, I have been shown a copy of the "Supplement" inserted in the back of the budget as delivered by the document room to the Chair. Mr. Speaker, I have ordinary acuity and visibility and I do my homework. I searched well, and there is no way that I could have missed this supplement had it been available in any of the three budgets on 3 separate days that I examined in detail—and indeed asked my staff to research. Subsequent information from the Bureau of the Budget, of the executive branch indicates the "Supplement" will be delivered to Members on request.

I believe the question should concern Members. When a proposal comes down like this in two parts, how can we exercise our will, and how can we use the ordinary protection of the minority rules, when decisions or rules are being bended severely, if not fragmented according to precedent? I personally resent this, if it has happened as I suspect.

I fear it does damage to the representative system of our Republic. I know it harms our House.

IS OIL IMPORT CONTROL PROGRAM TO BE CIRCUMVENTED?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's defense structure cannot be compromised to oblige New England political leaders who want to circumvent the oil import control program by setting up a foreign trade subzone with a refinery that would be served with foreign crude.

No State or political bloc can be granted economic advantage at the expense of national security. The proposal to establish reliance upon Libyan oil at a time when uncertainty and tension shroud the Middle East is defiant of U.S. safety. Oil imports are already so high that defense production on the east coast would be impaired in the event of a cut-off of ocean shipments.

Nothing has transpired to assure a continuing availability of oil from abroad since the import control program was created by President Eisenhower as a security measure. In addition to establishing a submarine base in Cuba, Russia has become shamelessly involved in the affairs of most or all of Africa's oil-producing countries.

America's overall interests dictate against permitting domestic fuel capacity to be reduced as an accommodation or convenience to sectional interests. With Soviet long-range underwater craft infesting the waters of the world, tankers would be easy prey under wartime conditions.

Unless and until the potential for international conflict is forever laid to rest, the United States cannot place dependence upon foreign oil any more than on airplanes or munitions, food or promises.

As for New England's claim that it must pay more for fuel than do other parts of the country, I would expect such a condition to persist in an area so far removed from fuel-producing areas. The cost of transportation is a recognizable item in the delivered price of commodities. It is the item which accounts for differentiations in the consumer costs of automobiles, oranges, lobsters, coconuts, and the Sunday New York Times. If price variances of this nature were to be made the base of developing import policy, we would have to employ so many more persons in the State and Commerce Departments and would have so many Americans out of work as a consequence of foreign competition that I question whether a single section of the country would experience economic improvement.

A great deal has been written about the machinations inherent in the plan to establish a foreign trade zone in Maine. I shall not refer to the political ramifications at this time. The Wall Street Journal editorial of last December 20 is a succinct description of the scheme.

At the same time, the Journal evidences a new concept with regard to quotas and subsidies. The editorial's title, "Turnabout," would seem particularly apt, in view of the newspaper's traditional policy on subsidies. The editorial follows:

TURNABOUT

In a way it's appropriate that the Government should be leaving the Maine oil refinery dispute to the incoming Nixon Administration. Oil import quotas, after all, were a legacy to the Democrats from the Eisenhower years.

The Maine situation is really a tangled mess. In case you haven't been able to stomach all the details, here's a highly simplified account of what's happened up to now:

Occidental Petroleum Co. wants to build a refinery at Machiasport, Me. That's simple enough, but from there on the going gets rougher. Occidental wants to put its plant in something called a "foreign trade zone," which isn't part of the U.S.—or rather, it is but it isn't. When governments start monkeying around with trade, things can get frightfully complicated.

If the Government will agree to put the Machiasport zone out of the Union, more or less, Occidental can bring in, tariff-free, foreign crude oil—which happens to be a lot cheaper than the U.S. variety—and process it. Nobody appears to object to that idea very much.

The trouble stems from the fact that Occidental wants to sell some of its refinery's products—heating oil and gasoline—in the undetached portion of the U.S. And that, if you listen to other oil companies and many Southwestern politicians, would destroy the oil import quota program.

Though other explanations are offered, the purpose of the quota program is to protect domestic oil producers from the competition of cheaper foreign oil. Even if such a subsidy is deemed a worthwhile aim of Government, it seems a clumsy idea to finance it by forcing all consumers—rich, poor or whatever—to pay more for oil. It seems even more questionable to involve the Government in distributing quotas to a favored few—each of whom is guaranteed significant profits when he sells cheaper foreign oil at the high U.S. price.

The setup is ready-made for controversy, and that's what's breaking out all over. Massachusetts Sen. Edward Kennedy, who thinks New England needs the refinery, hints none too subtly that the opposition may be breaking the antitrust laws. Maine's Gov. Kenneth Curtis says his state will go to court to force the Johnson Administration to act, whether it wants to or not. On the other side, spokesmen for the Southwestern states and the other oil firms are equally bitter.

It just simply won't do for the Nixon Administration—or the Johnson Administration, if it has a last-minute change of heart—to dispose only of this single dispute. If it approves the project the Government will be deluged with similar proposals from elsewhere, each of which will stir wrathful opposition. If, on the other hand, Washington rejects the refinery, the best it can hope for is long-drawn-out and angry court disputes.

So we're glad to see that the incoming Administration plans to thoroughly examine the quota setup itself. If Washington insists on subsidizing domestic oil firms, it would be more honest to do so openly instead of hiding the scheme in higher prices to consumers. Direct subsidies, undesirable as they are, tend to be easier to end than those built into the price system.

It's fashionable these days for politicians to express deep concern for the welfare of consumers. Here is a chance for them to do something about it.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SATTERFIELD (at the request of Mr. MARSH), for January 17, 1969, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. SAYLOR, today, for 15 minutes; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MADDEN.

Mr. BRAY in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Ohio) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. RUMSFELD.

Mr. SPRINGER.

Mr. CARTER.

Mr. SHRIVER.

Mr. MCCLORY.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. KEITH.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PETTIS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. O'KONSKI.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio in four instances.

Mr. SPRINGER.

Mr. CAHILL.

Mr. REINECKE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DANIEL of Virginia) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania in three instances.

Mr. RONAN.

Mr. PODELL.

Mr. RARICK in four instances.

Mr. DE LA GARZA in two instances.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida in five instances.

Mr. MOSS in five instances.

Mr. PICKLE in two instances.

Mr. HÉBERT.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10. An act to increase the per annum rate of compensation of the President of the United States.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JANUARY 20, 1969, AT 10:30 A.M.

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 20, 1969, at 10:30 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XX, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and refered as follows:

278. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations and other provisions for the fiscal years 1968, 1969, and 1970 (H. Doc. No. 91-50); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

279. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, Chairman, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies, transmitting the annual report for the period July 1, 1967, to June 30, 1968 (H. Doc. No. 91-52); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

280. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on control of agriculture-related pollution; to the Committee on Agriculture.

281. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the establishment and maintenance of strategic reserve stocks of agricultural commodities by producers and the Commodity Credit Corporation for national security, public protection, meeting international commitments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

282. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that various appropriations have been apportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriations, pursuant to the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 91–54)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am proud to transmit the Nineteenth Semiannual Report of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, covering the period January 1 through June 30, 1968.

This was a period of gratifying progress in the Nation's space effort. Project Apollo was within sight of its first manned flights—culminating in the magnificent flight of three brave astronauts in Apollo 8. At the same time, our satellites continued to provide meteorological and weather information to be used for the benefit of people all over the world, and to maintain channels for expanding and hastening communications among all nations.

I am pleased to bring this report to your attention.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 17, 1969.*

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 91–53)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the first annual report of the Secretary of Transportation.

The importance of transportation to the economy, security, and welfare of each American makes this report an important document which deserves careful reading.

In his report, the Secretary of Transportation reviews the state of the transportation system of the United States and described the initial efforts of the Department to aid in the improvement and development of the system.

Secretary Boyd has made gratifying progress in organizing the new Department, and has assembled a fine team to help him confront the many challenges arising out of the mission assigned the Department of Transportation by the Congress in Public Law 89–670.

The Department, during the period of the report, carried out its direct services to the public through five operating administrations, each headed by an Administrator reporting directly to the Secretary. The Department has five Assistant Secretaries, four of whom have substantive responsibilities, with one Assistant Secretary in charge of Administration. In addition, the Department has a General Counsel responsible for legal affairs.

As a result of the efforts of the Secretary and his staff, the Department reports a number of achievements during the three months in which it was in operation during fiscal year 1967. These achievements are set forth in the pages of the report, but I invite your attention especially to these:

A special effort was made to foster safety in transportation since the Coast Guard, the Federal Aviation Administration, the Federal Highway Administration, and the Federal Railroad Administration all have significant responsibilities in the field of safety. New programs in highway and automobile safety were successfully supported by the Department.

Both the Coast Guard and the Federal Aviation Administration have made important contributions to the Vietnam war effort. They have supplied skilled men and needed equipment in support of the efforts of our other forces.

Development work continues to improve the safety capacity of the Nation's airways. New techniques and equipment have been developed and in many instances are in the process of installation.

A new approach has been adopted for the planning of Federally supported highways, especially in cities, with a view to assuring that highways reflect design features and routings conducive to sound urban development as well as improved transportation.

New regulations have been developed and issued concerning safety features on automobiles, and work has been initiated to help States and communities establish highway safety programs.

The National System of Defense and Interstate Highways continued to receive Federal assistance, and tangible progress was made toward completion of the Interstate System as authorized by the Congress.

Both the National Motor Vehicle Safety Advisory Council and the National Highway Safety Advisory Committee began their operations.

Progress continued in the development of high speed passenger trains in spite of many technical and management problems.

A new record was set for tonnage transiting the Saint Lawrence Seaway, the United States portion of which is operated and maintained by the Department.

By these achievements in improving our national transportation system, I am pleased to report that the Transportation Department has shown a deep concern for the needs of the traveler and the shipper.

The Department has also moved to advance the welfare of our citizens by making certain that transportation is provided with due regard to its impact on our environment; land, air and water.

I commend these accomplishments and the enclosed report to your attention.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 17, 1969.*

SALARY REFORMS FOR UPPER LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 91–51)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Congress, the Executive Branch, and the Federal Judiciary are the vital nerve centers of government. Whoever mans them is involved in activities so momentous and far-reaching that they touch the lives of all our citizens—and indeed of people the world over. Our national interest demands—and our national survival requires—that America summon its best men and women to assume the power of decision and the responsibility of leadership for government in action.

Central to this concern is the matter of compensation at the top echelons of Government. Today, the salaries we pay our top officials are clearly inadequate.

THE KAPPEL COMMISSION

The record of the past has been one of inadequate and fragmentary adjustments in top-level compensation—always too little, often too late.

I believed in my Administration that the time had clearly come to re-examine the entire top Federal salary network. To this end, I asked the Congress to create a bipartisan commission to:

—Recommend any changes its study found necessary

—Review top-level Federal salaries every four years.

The Congress responded. In December 1967, I signed into law a measure which gave life to the Commission on Executive, Legislative and Judicial Salaries—the first such body in our Nation's history.

The Commission was composed of nine distinguished Americans:

Three were appointed by the President:

—Frederick R. Kappel, former Chairman of the Board of Directors of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, who served as the Commission's Chairman.

—John J. Corson, Consultant and Corporate Director.

—George Meany, President, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Two were appointed by the President of the Senate:

—Stephen K. Bailey, Dean, Maxwell Graduate School, Syracuse University.

—Sidney J. Weinberg, Senior Partner, Goldman, Sachs & Co.

Two were appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

—Edward H. Foley, Attorney, Former Undersecretary of the Treasury.

—William Spoelhof, President, Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Two were appointed by the Chief Justice of the United States:

—Arthur H. Dean, Attorney, Chairman, U.S. Delegation, Nuclear Test Ban and Disarmament Conference.

—William T. Gossett, Attorney, President, American Bar Association.

After a comprehensive study of top Federal salaries, the Commission concluded that:

—Present compensation levels are not commensurate with the importance of the positions held.

—These levels are not sufficient to support a standard of living that individuals qualified for such posts can fairly expect to enjoy and in many instances have long established.

—Action should be taken to modernize, without delay, the top pay structure of the Executive, Legislative and Judicial Branches of government.

THE RECOMMENDED REFORMS

Any recommendations the President might make for salary reform must be included in his budget. In preparing my budget for Fiscal Year 1970, I carefully reviewed the full report of the Kappel Commission. Their proposals served as a valuable guide as I weighed the recommendations the law requires me to make—recommendations which will become effective 30 days after they are submitted unless the Congress disapproves them during that period.

I agree with the recommendations of the Kappel Commission Report. If I alone had the power to put its recommendations into effect, I would do so. But in our proposal to the Congress and in the law passed by the Congress creating the Commission, final action on the report was to be a joint enterprise between the executive and legislative branches. I have therefore found it necessary to modify some of the Kappel Commission recommendations—particularly with respect to congressional salaries, and also with respect to the pay of certain executive positions.

I do recommend that the Kappel Commission proposals be put into effect for the top officials of the federal, judicial and executive branches. For them, I recommend the following pay scales:

Chief Justice: $62,500.

Associate Justices of the Supreme Court: $60,000.

Cabinet Heads: $60,000.

Of all the salaries, Congressional compensation posed the most difficult problem of all and was the hinge on which my recommendations turned. As the Commission pointed out:

> Members' salaries should be adjusted to compensate for the substantial and unique responsibilities they bear, to meet the cost peculiar to elective rather than appointive office, and to minimize the need to rely on other means of augmenting income.

The Commission then recommended that Congressional pay should be set at $50,000.

Congressional salaries have been raised in slow and piecemeal fashion, far outpaced by pay increases in the rest of the economy. Over the past three decades, Congressmen have received only three pay increases—an average of one pay raise every ten years—to the current level of $30,000, a salary which by today's standards is woefully inadequate.

I do not think that the American people want to see their elected representatives—who must bear the awesome burdens these critical times demand—serve their Nation at the price of financial hardship. I, therefore, believe that the $50,000 Congressional salary recommended by the Kappel Commission can be justified.

A proper concern for history and tradition, however, suggests that the President should consult the leaders of Congress before he makes any recommendations concerning Congressional salaries.

I have done that.

These discussions and consultations revealed that Congress would be reluctant to approve a $50,000 salary. When it comes to a pay increase, Congress puts its own members last in line. Instead, an increase to $42,500 was considered preferable and more likely to receive the necessary support. I respect the desires of the leaders of the Congress. I, therefore, now recommend a $42,500 salary for the Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

The Congressional salary I am recommending today represents an 89% increase over the level of compensation in 1955. I must point out, however, that during this same period salaries of the highest Civil Service career grade increased by well over 100 per cent.

Civil Service salaries, moreover, will be adjusted periodically to keep them comparable to those in industry—while Congressional salaries must, under current law, remain unchanged for the next four years.

Projections indicate the following salary increases between 1955 and 1972:

—Congressional salaries: 88.9 percent.

—Postal workers: 90 percent.

—Average Federal worker: 94 percent.

—Factory workers: 94 percent.

—Government Wage Board employees: 101 percent.

—GS–15 Career Civil Servant: 109 percent.

—GS–18 Career Civil Servant: 135 percent.

Thus, even with the recommended pay increase for our lawmakers, the increase in Congressional salaries will lag behind those of other Government workers and employees in the private sector.

Since the weight of custom and a sense of fairness require that we maintain and preserve proper pay relationships at the upper echelons of Government, the proposed $42,500 Congressional salary requires that I make certain adjustments in the Kappel Commission's proposals for other top level salaries. Accordingly, I recommend the following pay scales:

Level II (Heads of Major Agencies): $42,500.

Level III (Including Under Secretaries): $40,000.

Level IV (Including Ass't. Secretaries): $38,000.

Level V (Including Heads of Boards): $36,000.

My recommendations for the other top level positions covered by the Kappel Commission are set forth in my budget in accordance with the requirements of Public Law 90–206.

The salaries of the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, the Majority and Minority Leaders of the House and Senate and the President Pro Tem of the Senate were not, as such, covered by the Kappel Commission's charter. For this reason, I am submitting separate pay legislation embodying my recommendations, as follows:

Vice President: $62,500.

Speaker of the House: $62,500.

Majority and Minority Leaders of the House and Senate and President Pro Tem of the Senate: $55,000.

CONGRESSIONAL ALLOWANCES

The burdens imposed by Congressional service are unique. They often require members to bear extra expenses in connection with their official responsibilities.

Most lawmakers, for example, must maintain two homes for themselves and their families—one among the people in the district or state they serve; the other in or near the Nation's capital.

Recognizing these facts, the Federal tax laws have allowed deductions of up to $3,000 a year for living expenses at the seat of our national government.

That maximum deduction has remained fixed for 15 years now—while sessions of the Congress have grown longer and longer under the pressure of increasing workloads and crowded legislative calendars.

I believe we should increase the maximum deduction so that Members of Congress will not be required to use any new pay increase to defray some of the essential living expenses incurred in the pursuit of their official duties.

Accordingly, I recommend that the maximum Federal tax deduction for Congressional living expenses be raised by $2,500—from $3,000 to $5,500 for each member of Congress.

EXCELLENCE IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE

The proposals I make today are long overdue and urgently needed salary reforms at the upper levels of our government. But they are more than pay recommendations, for they cut to the heart of what modern government is all about—excellence in the pursuit of the public's business.

This moment of decision provides a unique occasion to strengthen the sinews of American government. We can do this by offering to our best and ablest citizens fair compensation for the job they must do in guiding America forward in the years ahead.

Just as these public servants—in the Congress, in the Cabinet and in the Judiciary—have a responsibility to the Nation, so the Nation has a responsibility to them.

The total amounts involved in my pay proposals are relatively small. But they will be wise investments in our future.

I urge the Congress to grasp the opportunity presented to it and to respond favorably to the recommendation I am submitting today.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 17, 1969.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the Presi-

attractions will be encouraged to go on and see others, and to stay in the area for several days.

Additionally, we must find ways and means of stimulating economic development of the region through increased tourism and recreation activities. To do this we need a full inventory of present resources and facilities, which, tied in with the inventory of present roads and the recommendations for future ones, will point the way for coordinated development by government and private agencies, and by private capital. For example, we need a guide for private investors who want to develop tourist accommodations, and other commercial enterprises to serve the greatly increased tourist trade expected in the area.

Within the circle are 17 national parks and monuments, and just outside within an easy drive are eight others.

As if this were not enough, the miracle of modern engineering in the very center of the area is the great Lake Powell Reservoir impounded by the Glen Canyon Dam, which has become a mecca for boating and outdoor enthusiasts.

My bill asks $150,000 for the survey, which, I again emphasize, would be directed not only toward helping both the State and Federal agencies plan toward a common goal, but to pointing out opportunities to private capital in the area.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 308) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct, in cooperation with the States and interested Federal agencies, a development survey of the recreational resources of the golden circle of national parks and monuments and associated science, recreation, and Indian areas in the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 309—INTRODUCTION OF BILL IN SUPPORT OF LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH POSTAL EMPLOYEE-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS BY LAW

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, many people have been preoccupied, and rightly so, with the concept of converting the postal system into a Government corporation, as recommended last year by the Kappel commission.

Such a far-reaching, revolutionary proposal, obviously demands the closest kind of scrutiny and study by the Congress. But this preoccupation should not blind us to the urgencies of another aspect of the general postal problem—a problem indeed that the Kappel commission ranks second in importance to its primary recommendation.

That secondary aspect—which in my judgment is one of great urgency—is the whole question of employee-management relations in Government and particularly in the postal service.

There is room for improvement of the Post Office Department, but none touches more lives or has a more direct relationship to the quality of postal service than the morale of its three-quarters of a million employees—and that morale today is at a low ebb. It could not be otherwise under a labor-management system that is heavily weighted in favor of management and against the employees.

Moreover, so long as labor-management relations are governed by the existing Presidential Executive order, there is going to be a continuing and built-in problem; for so long as there are no means available for effective appeal to an impartial third party, there will be frustration and mistrust among the rank and file of the thousands of men and women who move the mails.

I am, therefore, introducing today a separate bill—a bill apart from all the other issues and problems of the postal service—designed to correct this inequity.

Quite simply, it provides for compulsory arbitration of disputes; it creates an independent Labor-Management Relations Panel for this purpose, and finally it establishes clear-cut guidelines and standards for both management and labor in the fulfillment of their responsibilities.

When you consider how long the employees of the postal service have sought this elemental balance wheel, it is nothing less than amazing that things are not more desperate than they are among postal employees. It will be 20 years in March since the first labor-management bill for Federal and postal employees was introduced in Congress. Only once—only once—in those 20 years has there even been a public hearing on the issue, that is until last year when the full Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee did hold a brief but full-scale hearing on this subject.

The evidence of that hearing left no room for argument. A system which presupposes a mutuality of rights but provides only for unilateral remedy is morally wrong and legally without justice.

In the words of one witness, what is wrong is that a postal clerk can be suspended, separated, admonished, or reprimanded for the slightest violation of contract rules and postal regulations but there is nothing anyone can do about postmasters or supervisors who refuse to admit that a contract exists or who otherwise violate rules or law.

It is inconceivable to me that the Government should require its employees to be subject to the kind of one-sided procedures that in private industry would disrupt operations of nearly any business.

Which raises another vital question. The bill I am introducing does not in any sense of the word diminish or threaten the Federal laws which prohibit strikes in the Government service. There have been some unwarranted fears on this score in some uninformed quarters. When we talk about equitable labor-management relations in the public service, we are not involving the issue of strikes which remain forbidden, and ought to be.

All we are talking about is a modernized and dynamic employee relations mechanism which lays down the fundamental principle that free and friendly consultation between employees and management with machinery for orderly settlement of disputes is vital to a better postal service. Employees are entitled to be heard on matters affecting their conditions of work. And strong, democratic unions have a right to be encouraged in the postal establishment and by this Congress.

Aside from establishing independent machinery for compulsory setlement of disputes and grievances, this bill establishes policy criteria for granting exclusive postal union recognition based on postal crafts along with codes of proper conduct for employees and management alike. It also provides separate criteria for supervisors organizations.

Finally, the rights of representatives on both sides to testify, to question and to cross-examine witnesses—in other words to present their cases without danger of reprisal or intimidation—is guaranteed.

This is a forward step to encourage and to insure the continuing dedication of our thousands of postal employees. Its passage would affirm and extend the principles of Executive Order 10988 which was itself a giant step of enlightenment even though, in the years since it was issued, serious defects and shortcomings have inevitably diluted the high promise it originally contained. In any case, in matters of such urgency and importance affecting the welfare of so many thousands of employees, such machinery ought to be established by law now, rather than by the mere issuance of a Presidential order.

Every study of postal problems in recent years has highlighted the deterioration of employee morale in the postal service, and undesirable conditions of employment have often been stated to be key factors in the general worsening of service. This bill provides the medicine for a permanent cure—a cure long overdue—in one of the most vital arteries of the entire system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 309) to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 312—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO RESTORE THE FAMILY SEPARATION ALLOWANCE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, in what I believe was an unwise action, the Comptroller General of the United States in a ruling last year cut off the family separation allowance to nearly 25,000 service members who previously were entitled to the $30 monthly payment.

By act of Congress in 1963, this payment was authorized to married servicemen who were unable to take their wives and other dependents with them for assignments outside of the United States. The purpose of the allowance was to help offset the increased family expenses

arising from a father's separation from his family because of his military duties. The Comptroller General's ruling has deprived nearly 10 percent of all those entitled to this allowance from receiving any further payments since December 1, 1968. To some, $30 does not seem a great deal of money; but to many service families who are just barely making ends meet, it is the difference between solvency and financial trouble. This is especially so since the service families have included in their budgets this amount which they had been receiving every month since 1963.

The legislation which I introduce today would change this situation by authorizing the resumption of this payment. I think that my colleagues will agree with me that quick action on this matter is imperative if we are to avoid further aggravation of this distressed situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 312) to amend section 427 (b) of title 37, United States Code, to provide that a family separation allowance shall be paid to a member of a uniformed service even though the member does not maintain a residence or household for his dependents, subject to his management and control, introduced by Mr. TOWER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 324—INTRODUCTION OF PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY LAND BILL

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, last year, the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate District Committee, of which I was chairman, reported, and the Senate later passed, a bill to permit the District of Columbia to sell to Prince William County, Va., certain land in the county which the District acquired in 1922. Unfortunately, the bill never cleared the House of Representatives.

I am, consequently, reintroducing this legislation. No opposition was expressed to the bill last year during Senate committee hearings or on the Senate floor. I am, therefore, hopeful of prompt action on the legislation this session.

Prince William County, Va., seeks to acquire the 350.4 acres affected by the legislation for recreational purposes, construction of a water pollution control plant, and a sanitary landfill which will be shared by the District and Prince William County.

Committee hearings last year indicated that the bill would enable Prince William County to provide improved recreational, water pollution control, and disposal services and would in no way be detrimental to the District.

The affected property, known as Featherstone Point, is located on the Potomac River, about 27 miles from Washington, D.C.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 324) to authorize the Government of the District of Columbia to convey interests in certain property owned by the District of Columbia in Prince William County, Va., and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SPONG, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 334—INTRODUCTION OF BILL—VETERANS DISABILITY SEVERANCE PAY LEGISLATION

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, members of the Armed Forces of the United States rendered permanently unfit to perform their military duties because of a service incurred disability may, under certain specified conditions, be granted disability severance pay, which is a lump-sum nonrecurring benefit computed on the basis of rank and length of service.

Present law requires, however, that the amount of such severance pay shall be deducted from any compensation for the same disability to which the veteran may be entitled under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. As severance pay often amounts to several thousands of dollars and recovery of this amount from disability compensation generally requires an extended period of time, the present recoupment provisions often result in hardship situations.

On many occasions the service connected disability, which may have been ratable at 10- to 30-percent disabling at the time of discharge, unexpectedly changes into a totally disabling condition with consequent termination of the veteran's income.

In these instances the veteran may be granted a 100 percent disability rating by the Veterans' Administration, but the recoupment provisions continue to bar the payment of disability compensation until such time as the full amount of severance pay has been recouped.

In order to alleviate this type of hardship situation, I am today introducing legislation to provide that the rate at which disability severance pay may be recouped should be limited to a monthly amount not in excess of the compensation to which the veteran would currently be entitled for the degree of disability assigned on his initial VA rating.

My bill, Mr. President, will insure that the balance between that amount and any elevated evaluation is made payable to the veteran rather than being applied toward the recoupment of his severance pay.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 334) to revise the provisions of title 10, United States Code, relating to the recoupment of disability severance pay under certain conditions, introduced by Mr. MONTOYA, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 334

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1212(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Deduction of the disability severance pay from disability compensation shall be made at a monthly rate not in excess of the rate of compensation to which the former member would be entitled, based on the degree of his disability as determined on the initial Veterans' Administration rating."

S. 335—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PREVENT THE IMPORTATION OF ENDANGERED SPECIES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish and wildlife or parts thereof into the United States, and to prevent the interstate shipment of reptiles, amphibians, and other wildlife taken contrary to State law.

I originally introduced an endangered species bill during the 90th Congress, after I learned of the serious gap that exists in our own Nation's protection of the world's endangered species. Though a number of countries have tried to enforce some protective measures by establishing animal preserves and ascribing animal quotas, they are unable to stop the rapid disappearance of many beautiful and exotic species simply because countries like the United States continue to supply a huge market for illegally obtained furs and hides. In fact, the United States is presently the largest market in the world for these valuable skins, illegally taken in the country of origin.

Current fashion fads have placed many unique animals—such as the spotted leopard and the American alligator—in a precarious position. Also, the demand for exotic pets, including unusual varieties of monkeys and large wild cats, such as leopards, has placed even more species in danger of extinction.

In a shocking exposé of what he terms the "mail-order misery," the traffic in exotic wild pets, writer Roger Caras has documented the inhumane treatment of these animals which contributes to their high mortality rate. For example, in the Audubon magazine article entitled "Let There Be a Limit To Our Love," he describes the technique used in collecting specimens of the Gibbon monkey:

> All the native collector has to do is locate a female Gibbon carrying a baby and shoot her out of the tree. If the baby is not killed or hopelessly maimed in the fall, two men working together can pry the screaming infant's fingers off the mother's fur and get it into a sack without breaking its arms. There are certain inherent problems, however. Many babies will be injured in the fall—and this is wasteful of expensive ammunition. Also, most of the babies collected will die before reaching the homes of animal *lovers*. When a female Gibbon is fleeing in terror through the trees, it seems, it isn't possible to tell whether her baby has been weaned or not.

Mr. President, my bill is designed to offer some effective protection to the endangered species of the world, and to put an end to the thoughtless and inhumane exploitation of all fish and wild-

Witt, Morris, $1,600.85, July 1, 1962 to May 11, 1968.

Wrong step given or change from WB to GS.

Alazar, Edgar V., $276.80 May 8, 1966 to August 29, 1967.

Almaquer, Joe, $294.80, April 10, 1966 to August 29, 1967.

Arizpe, Facundo, $523.60, April 10, 1966 to August 27, 1967.

Baldwin, Mellie K., $264, May 22, 1966 to August 27, 1967.

Benavides, David R., $562.96, April 10, 1966 to June 8, 1968.

Cisneros, Orlando, $108.80, January 15, 1967 to August 27, 1967.

Cross, Mildred, $108.80, October 19, 1967 to May 25, 1968.

Davis, Alton E., $306.80, May 22, 1966 to November 11, 1967.

Flores, Simon E., $288, April 10, 1966 to August 27, 1967.

Gamboa, Joe M., $295.20, April 10, 1966 to August 27, 1967.

Hawks, Meredith G., $637.60, January 16, 1966 to June 1, 1968.

Howard, Thomas D., $412.87, November 13, 1966 to July 16, 1968

Martinez, Ismael, $298.40, April 10, 1966 to August 26, 1967.

Martinez, Jose C., $264.85, June 5, 1966 to August 27, 1967.

Martinez, Ramon L., $582.80, April 24, 1966 to July 6, 1968.

Martinez, Ruben, $90.60, February 4, 1968 to June 8, 1968.

Platt, Harry A., $302.65, April 24, 1966, to August 26, 1967.

Pozos, Domingo, $301.52, April 10, 1966 to August 26, 1967.

Quintero, Domingo G., $285.60, April 24, 1966 to August 27, 1967.

Reed, Harold B., $655.20, January 16, 1966 to June 29, 1968.

Rendon, Rudy M., $525.60, April 10, 1966 to June 15, 1968.

Robin, Harold A., $264, May 22, 1966 to August 27, 1967.

Sierra, Joe J., July 10, 1966 to August 9, 1968.

Sifuentes, Gasper V., $288, April 10, 1966 to August 26, 1967.

Smith, Marvin M., $440.80, January 2, 1966 to June 1, 1968.

Smith, Melvin G., $264, May 22, 1966 to August 27, 1967.

Sudduth, Ralph W., $542.40, July 17, 1966 to July 6, 1968.

Sunvision, Burl O., $441.60, January 2, 1966 to June 1, 1968.

White, O'Douglas, $122.70, May 8, 1966 to December 3, 1966.

Whorton, Doris R., $810.29, June 4, 1961 to July 25, 1965.

Thomas, Betty J., $476, June 5, 1966 to June 1, 1968.

Thompson, Fentress L., $564.20, July 10, 1966 to June 1, 1968.

Vela, Lupe, $279.80, May 8, 1966 to August 27, 1967.

Webb, Charles W., $264, May 22, 1966 to August 27, 1967.

Wells, Coy F., $440.80, January 2, 1966 to June 1, 1968.

Weinette, Richard C., $585.16, April 24, 1966 to July 13, 1968.

Time in lower grade used in computing waiting period for step increase in higher grade.

Findley, Helen F., $115.16, September 3, 1967 to May 11, 1968.

West, James W., $55.02, January 1, 1967 to June 18, 1967.

SEC. 4. No part of the amount appropriated in section 2 of this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provision of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

S. 24—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO AMEND THE FOREIGN SERVICE ACT OF 1946

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 941(b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

In summary, section 941(b) provides that if a dependent of a Foreign Service employee incurs an illness or injury abroad, the State Department may pay for the cost of treatment in excess of $35 up to a maximum of 120 days, but this maximum limitation does not apply if it is determined that the illness or injury was clearly caused by the fact that the dependent was located abroad.

The bill I am introducing would simply add to this a provision that neither shall the limitation apply if it is determined that the illness or injury was aggravated by the lack of prompt and adequate medical attention.

This bill stems from the Foreign Relations Committee's consideration in the last Congress of a private bill (S. 2969) for the relief of David E. Alter III, and his parents, Mr. and Mrs. David E. Alter, Jr. The purpose of that bill was to reimburse the family for medical expenses resulting from an injury which David E. Alter III, who was then 15 years old, sustained in Lusaka, Zambia, in 1965 while his father was the AID representative there.

The accident in which David was injured occurred when he was hit by a truck as he alighted from a car. At the Lusaka General Hospital, the injury was diagnosed as simple concussion and David was placed in bed with no treatment prescribed. Subsequently, it developed that he had suffered severe brain stem damage in addition to a fracture of the right leg, torn ligaments in both knees, a fractured nose, loss of a tooth, and lacerations.

David was later evacuated to the Army Hospital in Frankfurt and then to Washington. The accident occurred December 24, 1965. David did not regain consciousness until October 1966, and remained hospitalized until February 1967. He still requires nursing care in the home of his parents.

Pursuant to section 941(b) of the Foreign Service Act, the State Department paid for the first 120 days of David's hospitalization and treatment. At the time the Foreign Relations Committee considered the case last year, David's attending physician estimated that the total additional costs would be well in excess of $100,000, as compared to a limit of $40,000—plus $2,000 a year—provided by his father's insurance coverage under the high option of the Government-wide indemnity plan—Aetna—of the Federal employees' health benefits program.

The State Department terminated its payments for treatment after 120 days on the basis of a determination by its Medical Division that the injury was not clearly caused by the fact that David was located abroad. This determination was made on the narrow grounds that people are hit by trucks and suffer similar injuries in the United States. But as the Foreign Relations Committee pointed out in its report last year on S. 2969:

> This completely overlooks the fact that the victims of such injuries in the United States generally receive more prompt and adequate medical attention, thereby hastening their recovery and reducing complications. While David was a patient at the Washington Hospital Center, for example, persons suffering from similar injuries were admitted and discharged, able to walk and talk, within 3 months.

The committee report last year also noted that—

> Since section 941(b) was enacted as an amendment to the Foreign Service Act in 1958, from two to six cases a year have arisen in which a dependent has required treatment beyond 120 days and in which a finding has been made that the cause is not clearly related to the dependent's presence overseas. Without exception, these cases have arisen from accidents, the victims of which most likely would have received more prompt and adequate treatment in the United States. In the next Congress, the committee intends to give consideration to amending the Foreign Service Act to take account of this gap especially in the less-developed countries.

I am introducing this bill today to provide the basis for such consideration by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 24) to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946 so as to permit payment of certain costs of treatment of dependents of foreign service personnel where illnesses or injuries incurred abroad are aggravated by lack of prompt and adequate medical attention, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 25—INTRODUCTION OF GREAT SALT LAKE NATIONAL MONUMENT LEGISLATION

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill to establish a Great Salt Lake National Monument on Antelope Island near the southern end of Utah's unique inland sea.

Great Salt Lake—which is Utah's special landmark—is also one of our most neglected natural resources. Its remarkable scientific, historic, and recreational values are all underdeveloped.

When I came to Congress in 1959, I set as one of my goals the proper development of Great Salt Lake. Beginning with that Congress and in each succeeding Congress, I introduced bills on which extensive hearings were held in both Utah and Washington, and out of which developed a reasonable consensus as to what should be done. The bill I am introducing today is identical to the one which passed the Senate in the 90th Congress, but died in the House. It is a distillation of the best of all previous bills, and full hearings and committee and floor debate in the Senate. I am hopeful that it will be passed by both Houses in the 91st Congress, and that we can begin development of the Great Salt

Lake in a way which will fully realize its vast potential.

Mr. President, the Great Salt Lake is one of the truly unique geological features of the world.

The lake is the living remnant of huge Lake Bonneville of Pleistocene time. An Ice-Age lake, Bonneville covered much of northern Utah, eastern Nevada, and southern Idaho, in places to a depth of over 1,000 feet. The lake drained northward into the Columbia River system. As the climate of the world changed, evaporation from Bonneville's surface exceeded the inflow of fresh water, reducing the surface from about 20,000 square miles to near its present size, nearly 200 square miles.

Dissolved salts, left behind by the evaporation, have ranged from 16 to 26 percent and have accounted for many of the unusual qualities of Great Salt Lake. Its density supports a swimmer with no effort on his part. A great industry is developing to extract valuable minerals from the briny waters.

Antelope Island is about 15 miles long and 4 miles wide and its mountain tops rise 1,700 feet above the lake's surface. It is known as Antelope Island because of the antelope which used to graze there, and it is one of the few areas remaining in Utah which have not been changed by the pressures of a growing, mobile population, but is in a near primitive condition. It offers a readymade platform from which to see and interpret the present lake and its physical history. The wave-carved terraces from different stages of Lake Bonneville are visible. In addition there are magnificent views of Great Salt Lake and the other islands and promontories and mountain ranges that stand in and around the basin. The restricted but fascinating lake life, including reeflike algae deposits, and the products of evaporation can readily be interpreted from the island base.

It is also easy to visualize, from the island, the effect of Great Salt Lake, both as a barrier and as a magnet for fur trappers, explorers, Mormon pioneers, and the railroad builders, all major features of the story of America's westward expansion. Promontory Summit can be seen. This is the place on which the golden spike was driven in 1869, linking the east and west coasts by continental railroad. Built in 1849, the oldest house in Utah still used for its original purpose—as a ranchhouse—stands in a grassy setting.

Let me quote to you the Department of the Interior's conclusion as to scientific significance:

> Scientific significance is the hallmark of National Monument caliber for any feature, site or area. On this basis, Antelope Island merits National Monument status in its own right. The island as a whole comprises a complete topographic unit and it is the record of the drama of earth history which circumscribes the island from its present shoreline to the crests and promontories standing as much as 2,400 feet above the surface of Great Salt Lake. These are factors which contribute to the scientific significance of Antelope Island. It is doubtful whether any other location surpasses Antelope Island as a scientific exhibit of the story of Great Salt Lake and its ancestral lakes and as a place for its observation, study and enjoyment by visitors.

There is also great potential for recreational development on the north end of Antelope Island. Preliminary development plans include two salt water beaches and piers, a marina, bathhouses, picnic facilities, camping ground areas throughout the island, and facilities for horseback riding.

Causeways would be improved and surfaced to both the northern and southern tips of the island to provide easy access. The monument would be within minutes traveltime of nearly three-quarters of the population of the State of Utah—the island's southernmost tip is only about 12 miles from Salt Lake City.

Forty years ago there were people from all over the world swimming in the Great Salt Lake. In recent years, however, very few people—either Utahans or visitors—have been able to try the exhilarating waters because bathing facilities have been inadequate. Receding lake waters have left the famous old resort, Saltair, high and dry, and it has fallen into a sad state of disrepair. Other resorts along the southern edge of the lake are small, and their facilities limited. Enactment of this bill would again make Great Salt Lake a focal point for interested Americans and foreign visitors who would like to see and feel our great dead sea.

The island comprises about 26,000 acres, nearly all in private ownership. The establishment of the monument would also require acquisition of some 15,000 acres of relicted land left exposed by the receding waters and a band of water around the island. The island is owned by a ranching company which is willing to sell. Costs of acquisition are estimated at not more than $1,600,000 and development costs have been set by the National Park Service at $9,135,000.

Mr. President, The Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments recommended in 1963 that Antelope Island, or a portion of it, be authorized for establishment in the national park system.

There is strong support in Utah for development. The Governor, the Honorable Calvin L. Rampton, who has just been reelected by more than a 2-to-1 majority, has long favored my bill. The Great Salt Lake Authority, which is the State agency charged with recreational and technical responsibilites on the lake, newspapers published in Utah, county commissioners, municipal officials, and scores of private citizens have all urged that the Congress establish the Great Salt Lake National Monument.

It is time we enact this bill to establish a Great Salt Lake National Monument, and set about preserving and developing one of the world's most interesting natural phenomena.

I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Great Salt Lake National Monument in the State of Utah, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 25) to provide for the establishment of the Great Salt Lake National Monument, in the State of Utah, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 26—INTRODUCTION OF CANYONLANDS NATIONAL PARK BILL

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, at the time the Congress authorized the Canyonlands National Park in 1964, we recognized that the boundaries which we were establishing did not encompass all of the unique and magnificent scenery in the area which was of national park caliber. We knew that someday we would want to take another look—that we would want to consider bringing under the protection of the National Park Service some of the spectacular areas which border the boundaries of Canyonlands, and which are equal with the present park area in scenic, scientific, or historic interest.

The bill I am introducing today would expand the boundaries of the present park to add four additional tracts—mostly public lands—approximately 95,000 acres. Three of the tracts adjoin Canyonlands and the remaining tract is located a few miles to the west. Their addition would enlarge the park to approximately 350,000 acres.

The largest of the tracts to be added is the Maze, which comprises 49,233 acres directly west of the park, and embraces a rugged labyrinth of canyons and eroded geological forms, some of which no white man has ever seen yet.

The second largest tract comprises 31,347 acres lying along the northern boundary of Canyonlands, and includes the 4,562 acres of Dead Horse Point State Park which the Utah State Park and Recreation Commission once requested be taken into the national park.

The other two are tracts of approximately 11,952 acres which adjoin the southeast corner of Canyonlands and contain part of the famed Lavender Canyon, and an area of 3,178 acres known as Horseshoe Canyon, which is located about 7 miles west of the northwest corner of Canyonlands, and which contains some of the finest galleries of prehistoric pictographs in the country.

All of these new areas contain unique features and natural phenomena which have national significance. They should be kept in their undisturbed and natural state, and the best way to do this is to incorporate them into the park.

Before Canyonlands National Park was established, there had already been some vandalism in southeastern Utah. Both geological formations as well as Indian artifacts and pictographs had been destroyed. It was partly to give protection to many of these national treasures that I pressed for action on the original Canyonlands National Park bill.

Now, the publicity on the establishment of the park is bringing thousands of additional tourists into the area, and as roads are improved and extended and more campsites are completed, the number of visitors both to Canyonlands and the lands adjacent to it will increase. A $2½ million Canyonlands roadbuilding program is being undertaken with fiscal 1968 and 1969 funds, and more campgrounds and new trails are also being built. It is inevitable that as roads